

PUBLIC LIBRARY

FEB 10 1916

DETROIT.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XIV, No. 18 }
WHOLE NO. 357 }

FEBRUARY 12, 1916

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
{ \$3.00 A YEAR

CHRONICLE

Home News: The President's Speeches; a Poll of Opinions—The Philippine Freedom Bill—The War: Bulletin, Feb. 1, p. m.—Feb. 8, a. m.—Other Items. Austria-Hungary: Rumania; Union of Races. Belgium: The Letter of the Belgian Episcopate. Germany: East Prussia's War Damage—Completing Largest European Railway Station. Mexico: Internal Affairs; Outrages—The Yucatanian Feminists409-412

TOPICS OF INTEREST

XLIII—The Young Man and Auctioneering—Men, Party or Principle?—The Proposed National University—Your Boy—Some War Problems—The Hermitage of Seraphim413-419

COMMUNICATIONS

Woman Suffrage—Rational Athletics—Joseph Conrad's Religious Belief419-421

EDITORIALS

Dr. Carroll's Census Again—Dangerous Generosity—Mothers and "Movies"—That Blessed Word "Preparedness"—Dogberry in Boston—Four Cruel Tasks422-424

LITERATURE

Shelley and Byron.

REVIEWS: Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery Down to the Time of Innocent III—Manuale di Teosofia—Mother Goose—India and Its Faiths—Mysteries of the Mass in Reasoned Prayers—What Is a Christian?—The Art of the Moving Picture—Making the Movies.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS: "The Whitaker Almanac"—"Les Paroles de la Guerre"—The Current Catholic Mind—"A Short History of the English People"—"The Pioneers"—"The Years of Plenty"—"A Study in Socialism"—An Apprecia-

tion of Lionel Johnson—"Notes sur le Voyage de Chateaubriand en Amérique"—"The Protection of Neutral Right at Sea"—"La Guerra Mundial"425-428

EDUCATION

In Defense of the Teacher429, 430

SOCIOLOGY

Wholesale Contempt of Court430, 431

NOTE AND COMMENT

Anomalies of the Conflict in Montenegro—New York's Interest in Chicago's Archbishop—Contributions for the Society for the Propagation of the Faith—Mr. Balfour on the Necessity of Religious Education—A New Plan for Making Converts—An Official Justification of "Academic Freedom"431, 432

CHRONICLE

Home News.—The President's speech-making tour is over; the speeches given during the week differed very little from those delivered the week before. Only twice

The President's Speeches; a Poll of Opinions did the President commit himself to definite statements that attracted more than ordinary attention. At Kansas City he said:

I have not had soldiers enough to patrol the borders between here and Mexico. I have not had soldiers enough for the ordinary services of the army, and there are many things which it has been impossible for me to do which it was my duty to do, because there were no men to do them with.

Later, at St. Louis, he declared: "There is no navy in the world that has to cover so great an area of defense as the American navy, and it ought to be incomparably the greatest navy in the world." Both these assertions have called forth many expressions of opinion. Friends of the Administration offer the former statement as an apology for the Mexican policy; others subject it to rigid criticism. The opinion of the latter class may be judged by this abstract from the *Boston Evening Transcript*:

The field artillery today is recruited to only about seventy-seven per cent of its authorized strength; the cavalry stands at about seventy-five per cent of its authorized strength; and the infantry is fifty-three per cent short of its authorized strength. The imperative need of recruiting these three branches of the regular army to the maximum strength authorized by law has been urged upon the War Department by Major-General Leonard Wood and dozens of officers of the army throughout the last three years. At one time it was believed that Secretary Garrison would be able to persuade the President to approve these recommendations which require only the stroke of his pen to give them effect. To all such recommendations, even when they came with the urgent endorsement of his Secretary of War, President

Wilson has stubbornly refused his approval. Nor has he been willing to grant a hearing to officers of the army whose personal experience has given them first-hand facts about the imperative need of filling the vacancies in the regular army. Now comes the President with the public excuse that he has been compelled to shirk his duty to protect even our Southern frontier on account of the shortage of sufficient soldiers to patrol the border. . . .

The statement of the President about the navy has already been commented upon in Congress by Senator Norris, Representatives Kitchin, Allen, Sloan and Britten. As the majority of these are from the West their criticism is unfavorable. "The plea is purely political"; "the President would out-Herod Herod"; "his plan is worse than Teddy's"; "a year ago the President warned us against an increase in armament, this year he comes forward as the very champion of the preparedness forces." Such are the comments; no doubt the matter will be thoroughly thrashed out in Congress. Under date of February 3, the special correspondent of the *New York Evening Post* writes from Topeka that the President's tour

has not greatly altered the situation. The speeches strengthened belief in the President's sincerity of purpose, but, in the business community's view, his indulgence in generalities and veiled warnings weakened the effect. As yet, business interests in this section do not favor a program of extravagant expenditure on preparedness, and the President did not change this view among business men and bankers, though he awakened discussion of the situation, which it is felt may not have been adequately presented by the press. In general, business opinion is that we need more efficient management of present expenditures, rather than vast expansion of them; and it is opposed to heavy taxes for proposed plans.

The truth of these remarks will be tested when the debate begins in Congress.

On February 2, by the deciding vote of Vice-President Marshall, the Senate adopted the Clarke Amendment to

the Philippine Bill, which, should circumstances be favorable, grants independence to the Island, after two years; in case freedom is not given at that time, it must be granted not later than four years from the passage of the Bill, which was sent down to the House for discussion on February 5. Six Progressive Republicans voted with the Democrats; the vote stood 41 to 41, and the Vice-President's ballot decided the issue. There is no restraining clause in the amendment as adopted by the Senate. The President is given no discretion in the matter; Congress alone can grant the prospective freedom, and in the absence of other legislation the Chief Executive will be obliged to carry out the mandate. The Senate also voted out a clause providing that the United States should negotiate treaties by which the Powers would bind themselves to recognize the neutrality and independence of the Islands. In case of the failure of such negotiations the clause eliminated authorized the United States to guarantee for five years Philippine sovereignty and independence. Should the Bill be executed in its present form the Filipinos will have absolute freedom to shape their own destinies, unless the Islands are seized by another nation. Nothing was done by the Senate to guard the provisions of the Treaty of Paris, which placed upon the United States certain obligations expressed in this language:

The cession [of the Islands] cannot in any respect impair the property rights . . . of ecclesiastical or civic bodies, or any other associations . . . or of private individuals, of whatever nationality such individuals may be . . . The inhabitants of the territories . . . shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion.

There is much passionate criticism of the Senate's attitude toward the Islands on which the United States has already expended over \$1,000,000,000: \$600,000,000 in conquest, and some \$500,000,000 in government. Despite this enormous expenditure the Senate consented to consider a new amendment "to appropriate \$20,000,000 to educate Filipino children in a common form of language and to teach them the rudiments of free government."

The War.—Both the Allies and Germans report vigorous and continuous artillery fire at many points in Belgium and France, at Ypres, Hulloch, Loos, Neuville, west of Péronne, in the Champagne, Argonne, and Woevre districts, and in Alsace; but no change in the general situation has taken place. Minor engagements have occurred in the Courland, near Dubno, and north and south of Czernowitz. The Austrians have been on the offensive in the Trentino and at Goritz, but according to Italian dispatches they have been everywhere repulsed. In Albania the Austrians have moved further south toward Durazzo and have reached the Ishni River; the Bulgarians, however, seem to have made no progress.

From the other Balkan States no developments have been reported. Conflicting statements make it difficult to ascertain the precise positions of the armies in Armenia, Persia, and Mesopotamia; but the Turks in all these countries appear to be holding their own. In both East and West Africa the Germans have suffered reverses; in Kamerun in particular, they have found it necessary to fall back before the British and French forces, who now hold the entire seacoast and a number of towns in the interior. Fifteen thousand German troops have been interned in Spanish Guinea.

The Lusitania controversy has not yet reached a definite solution. The German Government has forwarded a reply to our latest communication, but the text of this document has not been published. Its general contents, however, have been given to the public. Germany has signified a readiness to accede to all of our demands except the one calling for a formal acknowledgment of the illegality of the sinking of the ship. What attitude the United States Government will take is not known at present.

On February 1 the British steamer Appam sailed into Hampton Roads under a German flag. This vessel, which had been given up for lost, had been captured on January 16 by a German raider off the African coast. She was taken in charge by some of the raider's crew and conveyed under the command of Lieutenant Hans Berg across the Atlantic to Norfolk. The ship has been declared by the United States to be a German prize of war. Diplomatic difficulties have resulted from the incident. Germany and Great Britain have made conflicting demands on our Government. Germany insists that we abide by the treaties of 1799 and 1828 between Prussia and the United States, according to which an asylum would be given to the German prize of war as long as her commander wished to avail himself of it. Great Britain cites Article XXI of the Hague convention of 1907, and demands that the vessel be either ordered to depart from Norfolk or else released and turned over to her original owners. The future status of the vessel has not yet been decided by the United States.

Austria-Hungary.—Discussing the speech delivered in the Rumanian Senate by the veteran statesman Petru Carp, in which he gave his reasons for advocating a union of Rumania with the Central Powers, the *Information* of Vienna finds that the main difficulty in the way of such an alliance consists in the suspicions entertained against Hungary because of its Rumanian population. In answer to this objection the aforesaid paper urges that a private foreign policy on the part of Hungary is rendered entirely impossible by the Pragmatic Sanction, since there can be a "foreign policy of the Hapsburg monarchy only." The cardinal principle of this policy, it says, is to secure the friendship of an independent and free

*Bulletin, Feb. 1,
p. m.-Feb. 8, a. m.*

*Rumania;
Union of Races*

Rumania. The presence of Rumanians in Hungary can lead only to measures of internal policy and not to any international attitude, except in as far as the Hungarian sentiment can influence the general course of the Dual Monarchy. Great insistence is therefore placed upon maintaining within Hungary the heartiest good will toward Rumania. With Petru Carp the Vienna organ gives the assurance that "Rumania never was and never will be a vassal of Hungary." That every obstacle which might hereafter prevent the "absolute cooperation" of all the races constituting the Dual Monarchy had now been swept away by the war, was the declaration recently made by the Hungarian political leader, Count Tisza. A united policy upon this delicate point may therefore be expected.

Belgium.—A letter addressed by the Episcopate of Belgium to the Episcopate of Germany and Austria-Hungary and dated November 24, 1915, has recently been published in the United States. The

*The Letter of the
Belgian Episcopate*

prelates recount the charges made against their people, and ask the appointment of an impartial tribunal to pass upon the truth of these accusations. The chief accusations noted by the Bishops are: (1) In the beginning of September, 1915, in a communication to the President of the United States, the Emperor of Germany said:

The Belgian Government has publicly encouraged the civil population to take part in this war which it had been preparing carefully for a long time. The cruelties committed in such a guerilla war by women and even by priests, on doctors and nurses, have been such that my generals have been finally obliged to have recourse to most rigorous methods to chastise the guilty and prevent the sanguinary population from continuing its criminal and abominable deeds.

The offer made at once by the Bishop of Namur to the military governor, to punish all priests convicted of this barbarity, was, say the Bishops, unnoticed; and as far as they know, this charge involving priests has never been withdrawn. (2) On May 10, 1915, the German White Book circulated in neutral countries, "these cowardly falsehoods":

German wounded have been stripped and killed, yes and frightfully mutilated by the Belgian population, and even women and young girls have taken part in such abominations. Wounded soldiers have had their eyes put out; their ears, nose, fingers . . . cut off; . . . in other cases, German soldiers have been poisoned, hanged to trees, have had boiling liquid poured over them and been sometimes burned so that they endured death in atrocious pain. Such bestial proceedings . . . are contrary to the fundamental principles of the laws of war and humanity.

In rebuttal, the Bishops say: "We know that these shameless accusations of the Imperial Government are from one end to the other, calumnies; we know it and swear it."

The Bishops point out that on January 24, 1915, and

February 10, 1915, the Cardinal of Malines (Cardinal Mercier), and the Bishop of Namur, on April 12, 1915, solicited from the Military Government the formation of a tribunal to be composed of German and Belgian arbiters in equal number, to be presided over by a delegate from a neutral State. But "our efforts met with an obstinate refusal." The letter then goes on to allege instances in which the German army in Belgium gave itself up to practices "contrary to all justice and to all sentiments of humanity," and enumerates five violations of the Hague Convention since the occupation of Belgium by Germany.

There is but one way, conclude the Bishops, to stop the scandal of counter-accusation: it is by bringing to the light of day the full truth, and the condemnation by religious authority of the guilty. Confusion reigns in minds; what one calls light, another calls darkness; what is good to some, is evil to others. The tribunal for the investigation of both sides to which we have the honor of inviting your delegates will help, such is the hope we nourish, to dissipate more than one doubt.

The letter is signed by Cardinal Mercier, the Bishops of Ghent, Bruges, Namur, Liège, and the Bishop-elect of Tournai.

Germany.—The detailed estimates of the losses and sufferings caused in East Prussia by the two Russian invasions have now been compiled. They are even greater

*East Prussia's
War Damage*

than had been suspected. The investigators state in their report that "only a portion of this damage may be attributed directly to the Russian vandalism," and that the rest must be ascribed to the inevitable ravages of war. It is almost universally admitted that the Russian forces which carried on the first invasion were soldierly and orderly. The acts of violence, plundering, murder, and wilful arson and destruction, with which the Russians are charged, are said to have occurred in the second and longer invasion. The total damages are estimated at \$375,000,000, as the lowest figure. The following are in brief the detailed statistics of the East Prussian losses:

Entirely or partly destroyed, 24 cities, 600 villages, 300 estates, and 34,000 buildings. Plundered, 100,000 residences. Killed or seriously injured, 2,000 civilians. Carried off to Russia, 10,700 persons. Fugitives who had to leave home, 350,000 to 400,000. Killed or carried off by the Russians, 135,000 horses, 250,000 cattle, 200,000 hogs, 50,000 sheep, 10,000 goats, 600,000 chickens and 50,000 geese.

The \$100,000,000 voted by the Prussian Diet for the relief of the provinces is said to be fast melting away, while the work of reconstruction has only begun. Oxen are being imported into the country and captured Russian horses, unfit for military purposes, as well as German war horses no longer serviceable for the army, are given free for farm service.

The immense railway station in Leipzig, the largest public work in Germany, has been finished on contract time, and put into service in spite of the war. The cost

Completing Largest European Railway Station of the new depot is \$33,000,000. Since it is to serve for the entire railway traffic between Prussia, Saxony, and South Germany, \$15,000,000 of the total cost are borne by Saxony, \$13,000,000 by Prussia, \$4,000,000 by the city of Leipzig, and \$1,000,000 by the Imperial Postal Department. The station has 26 tracks, 27 platforms, and accommodates 30 trains. The main building covers an area of 172,000 square feet, and each of the two wings is 295 feet long. The peace train schedule calls for a daily handling of 500 trains. The construction of the station, which is the largest in Europe, was begun in 1907.

Mexico.—For the most part the news from Mexico is unreliable. It is certain, however, that Villa, who was killed three times the week before last, has renewed his activities much to the discomfort of Carranza. The latter has issued a

**Internal Affairs;
Outrages**

decree by which Queretaro becomes the federal capital for one year. The real reason for this is that the "First Chief" is afraid to remain in Mexico City any length of time. Governor Aguilar of Vera Cruz has involved himself in a difficulty with our Department of State by ordaining that henceforth a foreigner who purchases property in the aforesaid State thereby becomes a Mexican citizen. The persecution of the Church is still relentless, especially in Yucatan. At the "Federation Night" of the Catholic Union of Boston, his Eminence Cardinal O'Connell protested against the Mexican outrages in this vigorous language:

Everyone of you here present has in his mind's eye a picture of the martyrs of the Coliseum, the devoted and heroic little groups of Christians who in prayer and faith awaited death from wild beasts, while from the rising circles of that great amphitheater men and women looked on without pity or shame. Those scenes are no more enacted in the Coliseum. They passed away with pagan Rome. But today, on this continent, in a country separated from ours by the Rio Grande, deeds as inhuman and shameful have been going on for more than two years, and large numbers of our citizens regard them only casually, or as acts that we are not bound to check, and I am ashamed to say it, some Americans are so lost to decency as to rejoice.

What has been going on in Mexico all this time? What is the state of affairs there today? What part has Villa played? What is his former ally and present enemy, Carranza, recognized by this Government, doing for justice and peace? Apart from their industry in gathering loot, they and their underlings have concentrated their energies on the persecution of the Catholic Church. Their villainies against bishops and priests, their beastly and sacrilegious outrages of women consecrated to God, their desecration and robbery of sanctuaries and institutions of charity and education that were ancient and revered when New England was an Indian hunting ground, have gone on in this twentieth century of the Christian era and have been permitted to go on unpunished, and were even aided by American munitions and firearms.

A few more such speeches will perhaps bring Catholics to a realization of the misery of the unfortunate Mexicans.

During the week the New York papers carried an item of news to the effect that Mexican women had demanded equal suffrage; the reference was to a request made by

**The Yucatanian
Feminists**

the Feminist Congress held in Merida, and described in AMERICA last week. The full text of the speech, "The Woman of the Future," delivered for the edification of the Yucatanian students and delegates to the Congress, by the superintendent of education, is now at hand. It is a bombastic plea for freedom from all sex restraint. The estimable ladies present, few in number, and by no means representative of Yucatanian thought, did not prove unsympathetic listeners, as is apparent from the following extracts from the chairlady's address:

What are the means we must use to free woman from the yoke of tradition? There can be no doubt that the first means to be used, or the first thing to be done, is to *defanaticize* her conscience; to throw down from their altars the divinities which hitherto have kept her on her knees, with her looks to the ground. . . . We must make her acquainted with her anthropologic faculties (*sic.*), her biological condition, her nature, her origin, in order that, fully realizing all these, and with the help of science, she may break through the circle of traditions and errors in which she is imprisoned. We must see that this work of true science and culture be done in the schools, thrusting aside all those social fears and restraints, which only serve to make errors live and last. We hold, then, that to form the free and conscious woman of tomorrow is the duty of the primary schools.

Another means to defanaticize woman, both in her maturity and in her early years, is by starting university extension courses or lectures whose object will be to substitute the genuine lessons of culture for the errors she fosters. We must root out of her mind *supernatural religion* and put science and art in its stead. Another tradition from which woman must be freed is that her only purpose is to reproduce the human species and take care of her offspring. If the soul of woman were on a level with that of any other species of mammals, she would have to conform to this natural law; but endowed with a brain competent to grasp the universe, she can simplify these natural duties and dedicate her energies and her time to occupations allowing her to work for her existence and social culture. Consequently we must teach woman how to simplify these natural duties. In the schools, in society, it is forbidden to woman to know or to speak of the phenomena which take place in her nature. Religion has ever required that woman ignore her sex in order that she may be kept in subjection and exploited.

There follow two more paragraphs, one on a subject that were better omitted, and a second in which co-education is demanded. Five resolutions are then presented. All of these bear on the sex question, either directly or indirectly, and unfortunately children are to be the victims of the feminists. Another triumph has been scored by the revolution whose ravages were lately described by Judge N. O. Howard of the New York Supreme Court, in these words:

The land is stricken by a deadly blight, the blight of anarchy. Atrocities, cruelties, desolation, chaos, carnage, lawlessness, ashes, this is Mexico. This riot of lust and blood is not a strife between great armed nations, where intervention would be insanity; it is a rampage of freebooters, rapers, and robbers.

These are hard but true words.

TOPICS OF INTEREST

XLIII—The Young Man and Auctioneering

AT first blush the vocation of an auctioneer would seem unimportant and commonplace. As to the latter, we may premise that no calling can be unworthy of note, which dates back to the famous Pretorian auction of the whole Roman Empire to the highest bidder after the auctioneers had assassinated Pertinax. To be sure only two bidders could attempt the purchase, Julian and Sulpician. But the event corresponded in every term to the present definition of an auction, that is, a proceeding by which persons are invited to compete for the purchase of real or personal property by successive offers of individual bids.

In Roman times the questor acted as an auctioneer, that is, as the person authorized by law to conduct an auction. But when commentators discuss the *Corpus Juris Civilis* relative to auctions, they are not clear on the frequency of the transaction and, indeed, the proceeding may have been little used, even as a last resort in the disposition of property.

It is useless to do more than to refer to the old English method of lighting a candle and accepting bids only so long as the candle burned, called "candlestick auction," or to outline the "dumb" way of bidding, or to marvel at the severe and rugged honesty always the characteristic of public sales in Scotland, or to dwell upon the variations of a Dutch auction, for these curious customs did not long survive and had no effect upon the modern form which is practically universal among civilized as well as uncivilized peoples.

Today there are but two styles of auction, one public, which is an exposing of property under order of the court or otherwise in due process of law for sale to the highest bidder, and the other private, which is private only in that the sale is at the behest or upon the authority of private persons, and public in the broad sense that the people generally are free to attend the sale.

The vocation of an auctioneer is by no means to be despised, for the profession, if I may so term it, and I am not alone in thinking it deserves such an attribute, has its responsibilities, often burdensome, and its rewards, by no means negligible. Moreover, the field is never crowded.

As a quasi-public official the auctioneer is always obliged to furnish a substantial bond for the faithful performance of his duties. Authority for the requirement of this obligation is found either in city ordinance or State law. The bond is in favor of the governing body and enures to the use and benefit of any citizen who may deem himself aggrieved by the auctioneer's conduct of his business. In England there is a society of licensed auctioneers which numbers over 2,000 members, and in our large cities, as in the country districts, the smaller

number who give their exclusive attention to the profession are respected, if not always wealthy, members of the community.

An auctioneer has many duties which call for clear-cut principles of right business action and eminently fair dealing toward the courts, whose designated officer he may become in many cases, toward the public, his clients and his customers or bidders. The auctioneer is usually required to advertise his sales in a printed catalogue and to announce the terms and conditions of the sale before offering the property. Before exposing his subject-matter it is of the utmost importance that he properly describe it, and this description must be apt and particular. In case of realty, metes and bounds must be set forth with exactitude, due and timely notice given of encumbrances, appurtenances enumerated, buildings fairly outlined. Should the description be insufficient, litigation may ensue; and if the description is improper, the law will certainly be invoked, usually to the discomfort of the auctioneer and his bondsmen, even though the auctioneer is deemed to make no warranty either of chattels or realty.

The auctioneer cannot "knock down" property to anyone but the highest responsible and *bona fide* bidder, and in a private auction he should take care, under all but exceptional circumstances, that the vendor should not bid. He must see that the conditions of the sale as to the deposit of all the purchase money, or of part, with an agreement to pay the balance within a certain and reasonable time, are complied with fully and exactly. He is not allowed to accept anything but cash, or its equivalent from responsible parties, on deposit, and must always demand that those whose bids are finally accepted sign an agreement and deposit their money before leaving his salesroom. Such agreements are in legal form and phraseology, usually written under a printed copy of the catalogue description above mentioned.

Should property be put up at a private sale and an "upset" price fixed, i. e., a figure which must be reached before a bidder is allowed to become a purchaser, the auctioneer is obligated, usually by law, not to disclose such figure. And irresponsible withdrawal of property from sale after it is once exposed is not permitted.

In olden days there were numerous "mock-auctions," where known "barkers," together with "outroppers," whose connection with the seller was impossible of proof, if not unrecognizable, banded with land and chattel pirates to bilk the public. Even today when such characters have been sternly legislated out of existence, the auctioneer, in law the seller's agent, must be on his guard against even the appearance of agreed non-competitive bidding, or "knockouts," for the court's approval is always necessary to the consummation of a judicial sale and the court's arm may be invoked in all cases to overturn sales palpably fraudulent.

The modern auctioneer is forbidden to delegate his authority or duties, for it is held that he has been selected

because of the public trust and confidence in him personally. He is liable, as we have seen, for improper descriptions or misleading statements in his catalogue, or in his notice of the terms and conditions of the sales. While he is not liable for interest upon funds remaining in his hands for a reasonable length of time, he is responsible for the care and conservation of property entrusted to him for disposal. He may be liable to the seller, as his agent, for the purchase price of property, and hence is entitled to sue in his own name anyone who has failed to make good his accepted bid.

An auctioneer may charge and obtain a reasonable amount for his expenses in connection with sales; and is allowed funds to cover costs of advertising by posters, hand-bills and in the columns of daily newspapers and legal journals, made necessary by rule of court or general law. His compensation is usually a commission, ranging from two to six per cent, upon the funds raised by his exertions. And to aid him in the collection of his charges, he is entitled to a lien upon all goods and moneys left with him. In the case of real estate, the face value of the property is frequently the basis of his returns. For example, where a property subject to an existing mortgage of \$1,000, unexpired and not to be called, brings an additional \$1,000 at a sale, the auctioneer's commission is a percentage of \$2,000. The auctioneer is frequently appointed to act as master or referee to represent the court in judicial sales, where his compensation may be much larger than six per cent of the fund; and he may earn agreed fees when called as appraiser or expert witness on values in public and private proceedings. And his annual stipends as crier at sheriff's, marshal's, and constable's sales are not inconsiderable. He sells property under legal execution to satisfy money judgments. Building operations are closed out under his hammer, estates are settled and real estate incapable of physical partition is turned into money.

The modern auctioneer, therefore, is a person of responsibility and respectability in our communities, and must be able to do far more than make "a public outcry." He should be a student of commercial law and know the law of sales of real and personal property. He must have at his finger-ends the sometimes intricate procedure of judicial and extra-judicial vendues, public and private auctions. He must be so trained as to be able to express himself in language that is full and clear. For he must describe the subject-matter of his sales in an intelligent, convincing manner. He must be trained in remembering and appreciating values and must be quick as well as sure in his appraisal of persons as well as property. His memory must be ready and retentive of faces as well as figures. His records should be complete and flawless. He must know always the legal distinction between movables and immovables and when to apply the cast-iron rules of *caveat emptor*.

The auctioneer cannot always seek fees, for he must be ready to advise prospective sellers without charge.

His profession has its etiquette and its secrets, its interests, even its allurements. The rewards are compensatory. The field is large, its occupants few in number. With careful preparation and apprenticeship it may be invaded with success.

Philadelphia.

JAMES M. DOHAN.

Men, Party or Principle?

LAWS and laws and always more laws until someone finds out, perhaps, that laws like liquor and lucre are best taken moderately. That is the painful history of social reform by legislation, when the legislation fails to spring from a powerful sentiment. However, laws are a pretty stern necessity, and to get laws enacted in a democracy with any precision, parties are necessary, that is, out-and-out political parties.

But why say all this? Who ever denied the value of parties in a democracy? Well, the answer is immoderately simple. The same type of mind that denies the value of private property, religion, marriage, medicine, science and all other such common sense necessities is also busy denying the value of political parties, and with exuberant inconsistency busy at the same time in forming "non-partisan" parties.

A discussion of parties would have no place in a non-political paper such as AMERICA if the discussion did not dig a great deal deeper into the roots of our national life than the mere political names we know so well. The protest against party government is beginning in cities. This protest I feel is a symptom rather than a disease. It is a symptom of the loose, careless thinking that gives zest to the empty-headed and makes common sense the most uncommon article in American life. Let me explain.

The modern municipal Solon does not believe in nominations by parties. Instead, he wants nominations by small groups of citizens direct. This, he believes, will defeat "machine" politics and usher in an era of unselfish devotion to city interests. The theory is plausible when taken alone. Government by the people instead of by parties. Excellent! But one great big fundamental issue has been left out. We ask, government by *which* people? Government is one thing; democratic government is another. The difference between the two is summed up in one invaluable word, responsibility. Where is the responsibility in the new municipal government?

To be practical: let us suppose that five men have been nominated for the office of mayor in a given city. A very small percentage of the voters have nominated each candidate, in no case a large enough percentage to elect their candidate. Election day comes, one of the five nominees is elected by a moderate plurality. He is mayor-elect. But who elected him? The Australian secret ballot, the arch-foe of corrupt politics, smiles knowingly. No one will ever know who elected the mayor. Grant-

ing even that the few signers of his nomination papers actually voted for him, where did the rest come from? Technically, he is responsible to the whole city, but if he actually fails to do his duty, who is responsible? Not his nominators, certainly, because they alone could not elect him. Not any one party, certainly, because there are no more parties. Is his responsibility increased or lessened? Much depends upon what is meant by responsibility. His responsibility in conscience remains unchanged. But speaking from a practical standpoint, to whom is he responsible? Here the theory breaks down. A responsibility which is not definite tends to become no responsibility at all.

My point, then, is this: without party government, and direct party responsibility for nomination, and presumably for election also, politics degenerate into personalities, it loses dignity and respect, it leaves the great mass of the citizen voters in a deep obscurity and perplexity. Instead of a party gaining credit by a good nomination and ignominy by a bad one, instead of the average voter being able to fix the responsibility for good or bad management upon one of two or three large factors, the new system multiplies a hundred-fold the chances for personal intrigue and public deception. Every public officer becomes his own political boss. In the case of a Common Council, for example, if mismanagement occurs, how is it possible for the busy voter to examine the individual records of each member. Instead of being able to say "The Republicans or Democrats were in power, they did badly, I'll give the opposition my vote," he must vote for a long string of individual candidates. The chances are ten to one that he will vote for the cleverest politicians rather than the most honest men.

In the last gasp, then, "non-partisan" government becomes simply one more of those twentieth century delusions that starts with an ideal and ends in the common slough of irresponsibility. Irresponsibility has caused our present economic abuses; irresponsibility is seen beneath the ideals of Socialism, atheism, free-love, spiritualism and a hungry, greedy capitalism. Irresponsibility to God or man or morals enables nations to set the world ablaze and to demand as a sovereign right limitless opportunity for bloodshed.

The new ideas of city government are symptoms, then, and nothing more. They are symptoms of an irresponsible individualism which is the very antithesis of Catholicism. We need more responsibility, not less. We need more unified action, more action on a large scale, more simplicity. We need more of the spirit of compromise and accommodation that makes it possible for one hundred million people to unite under two or three large principles, and to fight openly and honestly for their accomplishment. Individualism downs hard; but until it is kept down, and until we are dominated by larger ideals, we can never hope for the triumph of a true or a noble democracy.

RICHARD DANA SKINNER.

The Proposed National University*

IN these papers two questions will be discussed. The first is, would an Act of Congress establishing a National University be valid under the Constitution; the second, would this Act be wise and expedient, granting its constitutionality?

A rational discussion of the first question involves the examination of certain principles fundamental to the Constitution. James Bryce, in his "Studies in History and Jurisprudence," has divided all known constitutions into "Flexible and Rigid Constitutions." Ours was the first complete Rigid Constitution; many other nations have since copied it. Such a Constitution as that of Rome or England is of the flexible type, though, strictly speaking, neither is a Constitution at all. Fundamental laws could be changed with little delay, although the veto of the English King in other ages and that of the House of Lords in more recent times have acted as checks upon the Commons, and have given the Government the qualities of continuity and stability. Our Constitution was designed to curb hasty, over-zealous radicalism, to impede plausible fads, to afford reasonable protection to the minority of a year or a generation, to give the National Government full sway in strictly national affairs and to reserve to the States power over all domestic matters. It thereby encourages a needed diversity in law and government, gives fair treatment to local conditions and prevents the sudden and disastrous sweep of political hurricanes, to which even our country may at times be exposed.

True, from the adoption of the Constitution in 1789 until some years after the Civil War, two strong political parties had violent disputes over the proper construction of our great charter, the one side contending for a strict, and the other for an expansive, construction. Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun were champions of the former school; Alexander Hamilton, Chief Justice Marshall, Daniel Webster and Henry Clay of the latter. Some cocksure reformers, who do not wish to be balked in any effort to carry out quickly radical experiments, would make our Constitution as flexible and as unsubstantial as the so-called Constitution of England, as changeable as the chameleon or as insecure and as short-lived as an act of a State legislature. The Constitution was intended to be a bulwark against any flood of folly or passion; novelty-seekers would make it the swinging water-gate that yields freely to every sudden freshet in a creek.

In "The American Commonwealth," Bryce has said that everything is changing in America, "the apparently inflexible Constitution not excepted." Yet in 1821 Marshall declared in *Cohens vs. Virginia*, 6 Wharton 384, 390: "A constitution is framed for ages to come, and is designed to approach immortality, as nearly as human in-

*The first of a series of three articles.

stitutions can approach it." The masses seldom appreciate the value of ancient usages and restraints, or the misuse that may be made later of ill-considered precedents, or the far-reaching effects or tendencies of apparently slight changes in fundamental laws or in old constructions. *Moribus antiquis stat res Romana virisque*. It is a constant struggle to keep our foundations from being undermined by miners and sappers of every kind. We must know the words and the spirit of the Constitution and the dangers to which it is subject. *Abeunt studia in mores*. To be safe we must have one important quality of our ancestors, of whom the immortal Edmund Burke, in 1774, said:

In other countries, the people, more simple and of a less mercurial cast, judge of an ill principle in government only by an actual grievance; here they anticipate the evil and judge of the pressure of the grievance by the badness of the principle. They augur misgovernment at a distance; and sniff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze.

It is useless now to discuss whether our Constitution was made or ratified as a covenant by the States as corporate bodies and as sovereign commonwealths, or by the people of each State, acting directly through delegates selected for the purpose. Nobody now contends that a State can nullify an Act of Congress or can secede from the Union, or that the Supreme Court can be denied authority to give the final or conclusive judgment whenever the rights or powers of the States and the Federal Government under the Constitution are disputed. Those questions are settled forever. But it is also clear that Congress and our administrative officers in Washington, have constantly encroached upon the rights and powers of the States and have stretched the claims and enlarged the activities of the Federal Government, each encroachment being used as a precedent for another. Every good citizen should resent further encroachments, and every public man should wish that said of him, which Story said of Chief Justice Marshall: that in his public life, there were "no timid surrenders to popular clamor, no eager reaches for popular favor." All of us should revere the Constitution as the citadel of liberty and defend it against attacks however plausible or popular.

Yet it is necessary to stress the fact that American constitutional government has its strict limits. Webster, in the Senate in 1830, said of the Federal Government: "They (the people) have made it a *limited* government. . . . They have restrained it to the exercise of such powers as are granted; and all others, they declare, are reserved to the States or the people." In *Martin vs. Hunter*, 1 Wheaton 304, 326 (in 1816) the Supreme Court, through Justice Story, said:

The Government, then, of the United States, can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given, or given by necessary implication. The words are to be taken in their natural and obvious sense, and not in a sense unreasonably restricted or enlarged.

In the *Federalist*, No. 44, Madison thus argues for the adoption of the Constitution:

The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State Governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce; with which last the power of taxation will, for the most part, be connected. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects, which in the ordinary course of affairs concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the People, and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State.

Story on the Constitution (Vol. 1, p. 320, sec. 418), says:

For instance, the Constitution declares that the powers of Congress (Article I, Section 8) shall extend to certain *enumerated* cases. This specification of particulars, evidently excludes all pretensions to a general legislative authority. Why? Because an affirmative grant of special powers would be absurd, as well as useless, if a general authority were intended.

In Cooley's "Constitutional Limitations," it is said that in these "enumerated powers" should be found the authority "for the exercise of any power which the national government assumes to possess." In *McCulloch vs. Maryland*, 4 Wheaton 316 (in 1819) the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Marshall writing the opinion, held that the Act of Congress of 1816, to incorporate the Bank of the United States was valid as an appropriate "means" to carry out the express power to levy taxes, to borrow money, to regulate commerce, to declare and conduct war, to raise and support armies and a navy; that Congress was given "incidental powers" to enable it to carry out the "express powers" mentioned, because subsection 18 of section 8 of Article 1, gave Congress the right "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers"; and that a bank was "a convenient, useful and essential instrument in the prosecution of its fiscal operations," etc. But he also held that, if Congress "under the pretext of executing its powers" should "pass laws for the accomplishment of objects not entrusted to the government," the act would be invalid.

Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, who vetoed the Act to renew the Charter of the United States Bank in 1832, John C. Calhoun, and many other eminent men firmly resisted Marshall's so-called "loose construction" and his theory of implied or "incidental powers." But, on the whole, the theories of Marshall's opponents, the "strict constructionists," were too extreme, just as now the tendency of his followers is to force us too far in the direction of a latitudinarian construction which will enlarge the powers and extend the activities of the Federal Government beyond all reasonable bounds. It is fairly plain that the proposal to establish a National University must rest upon a forced "latitudinarian construction."

EDWARD J. McDERMOTT, LL.B., LL.D.

Sometime Lieutenant-Governor of Kentucky.

Your Boy

NO man is entirely satisfied with his own accomplishments. Now and then, as the years roll on, he recognizes the fact that his list of achievements might have been greater. In his son, however, he lives again. Through him he hopes yet to attain the insurmountable heights. Hence it is that every Catholic father should be particularly solicitous as to his son's mental development. Nothing has a more important bearing upon this than college education. So the present-day system of non-Catholic training is worthy of his attention.

Very often it is impossible to send the boy to a Catholic college. The danger zones of the present American plan should be known and guarded against in that case. If the course chosen leads to the degree of B. A., likely enough it will embrace a course in philosophy. Philosophy has been defined as "the profound knowledge of the universal order, of the duties which that order imposes, and of the knowledge which man acquires from reality." If the boy is a bright, intelligent youth, the chances are that such a course will be the crowning glory of his college days. In comparison with it, the lesser lights of language, mathematics, history, and science will seem dull and uninteresting. In other words, at twenty the human heart is searching for the meaning of this universe, and the human mind is anxious to explore its unknown depths. That is a natural and worthy propensity.

The average Catholic college aims to supply the appetite in this direction by a thorough course in the subject mentioned, which course will strengthen instead of weakening the young man's religion. Very often in non-Catholic schools the reverse happens. Of course in the latter colleges and universities, the effect secured depends largely upon the teacher, his beliefs, his method of instruction and the text-books used. But it is a fair assumption that Catholic philosophy in its entirety will not be found in a non-Catholic school.

The result is not always detrimental. If the boy grown to manhood is a real student, his researches will not have ended with his college days, but in the quiet of his own fireside he will pursue with equal diligence what Catholic thinkers have to say upon the same subjects. In that case it may be that his previous training will act as a spur and an incentive toward further effort. Some of our best Catholics and wisest philosophers have been won to Catholicism through study. But such a man is an exception to the ordinary run of individuals. The average youth takes what the college gives him and his mental growth in academic fields stops there. The Catholic boy too often leaves the non-Catholic school with a smattering of truth, with a half-thought-out system, and a few catch-phrases which stick in his memory. All of these negative the teachings of the Church. Not only do they negative the teachings of the Church, but they contradict fundamental tenets of Christianity, engendering doubt as to the reality of God as we ourselves know Him.

It is a sad criticism to make of the modern educational method, and yet its truth is easily substantiated. The reason is often found in the ignorance of the educators themselves who have not sufficient mental prowess to find truth as it exists.

Anyhow danger lurks in the course in philosophy as taught in our modern colleges which are non-Catholic. To offset this danger an active effort should be made by the parents. If the priest of the parish has had the necessary training, and now has the inclination and time, it might be an excellent thing to secure his services in outlining a course in reading from Catholic works, which could be carried on simultaneously with the regular curriculum. If this is found impossible, no better single work exists to put into the hands of the student than the "Catholic Encyclopedia." Busy with his regular school duties the boy will probably not read any work continuously, so an encyclopedia will serve a better purpose than a consecutive treatise upon any given subject. In fact whether your boy is taking philosophy or not this work should be placed in his hands. There are few subjects touching his religion that are not found in that compilation. An occasional half-hour spent in perusing its contents will make him a bigger and a better man. After all, your boy, lowly creature that he is, but with a mental and spiritual equipment so far superior to the animals, is a wonderful creation; for "when in speaking of the Infinite we attribute conceivable perfection to Him, we must not forget that the predicates which we employ to describe perfection derive their meaning and connotation in the first instance from their application to finite beings." Your boy was created to the image and likeness of God. In so far as he learns true philosophy he will approach the Infinite in intelligence and goodness. In so far as he becomes imbued with a false doctrine he will not accomplish the object of your heart's desire.

W. H. LEARY,

Dean of the Law School, University of Utah.

Some War Problems

ONLY imaginative and reflective young men can enjoy the mature luxury of keen spectatorship of the great war; the very great majority of them follow in the grooves of paternal thought or accept the headline doctrines of the press as their guide to an intelligent reading of the epoch-in-making, while large numbers of them testify to the mentally benumbing influence of modern existence by remaining absolutely indifferent to the tremendous issues at stake. Yet a little serious consideration cannot fail to convince the observer that the generation now entering into the first stage of manhood has been materially, even vitally affected by the European upheaval. In Europe we find an indefinite, but quite important fraction of the young manhood undergoing the great adventure of soldiering; and the young men who are not monopolized by actual fighting have their mental life effectively disturbed by the din of battle. It is indeed thrilling to see a few thousand youths march through London streets en route to France, a lively band accompanying. A certain pride exalts the plain-clothed civilian when he is told that these same young warriors, twelve months ago, were fray-

ing their sleeves and staining their fingers at office drudgery; but the general lack of vision is unconsciously published by the popular song which prophesies the boisterous affection to be displayed "when the boys come home."

Still, it is permissible to assume narrowly that Europe will bury her dead and her hatchets, and smooth out her sorely-scarred complexion without reflecting any of the incidental travail in our direction. It is permissible, but it is quite wrong and logically futile. Whatever logomachy-loving scientists may have done to disprove the benefits of unrestrained "evolution," those who are really industrious among them have demonstrated, even to the limited intellect of the grotesque Sunday-section votary, that the world is not infinite; that the numbering of the grains of sand inexorably demands an economic union of mankind, although that union be merely, but severely, technical. Interdependence is the basis of altruism. Without irony this means that what is at present happening to the young men of Europe will some day probably happen to the young men of America.

National neutrality, under medieval conditions, might have been a delightful, a most delightful state. Today it incurs a good deal of the stress of war-making. It can be assumed, without quibble, that every human inhabitant of America has been affected in some material way by the war abroad. Before the war, commenced, a stern period of depression weighed upon us without much immediate promise of commercial aeration. Now we have the anomaly of sprightly prosperity in war-connected industries, and survival-of-the-fittest conditions in numerous ways of life, both industrial, commercial and professional. Such circumstances embrace young manhood with peculiar insistence. Our schools and colleges turn thousands of young men out of doors every year to take their places in the hierarchy of the work-a-day world. During the half-century of America's marvelous development the annual advent of the fledglings was unconsciously but quite comfortably accommodated by the vast national industrial and vocational machinery. A disturbance in this happy perennial process was noticeable at the beginning of the second decade of this century; but nobody took alarm. It remained for the war to bring home the full force of the surprise.

The young man of today is in a quandary. The muddling procrastination of our respected forbears has set the problem down among us: both we and it must go into solution. Unemployment, far from being a temporary symptom of "hard times" is a chronic economic condition. With old men, the problem is a tragedy; but to young men it is something worse than a tragedy, an acute presentation of the world's sharp edge on the threshold of a career. The ultimate effect of the war, in destroying much of the wealth of the world, will be a reduction in the number of "jobs," and the young men, in particular, will feel this reduction. Go out today and ask any man who occupies any kind of influential position and he will tell you that the appearance of ambitious young men with excellent letters of introduction is a matter of ennui.

The surplus of novices for the so-called gentlemanly callings has passed the stage of serious study and is now being dealt with by the humorists. Doctors, lawyers, journalists, how many hundreds of young men, with the traditional qualifications for these professions, are being forced to adopt other means of livelihood. To the young, well-educated fellow, bereft of special means and influence, the task of obtaining a genuine opening in the professional world is insuperable unless his gifts of body and mind are remarkable. The ambitious artist has forsaken the starve-in-a-garret tradition. He must assume aggressive tactics if he would even enter the labyrinth of success. The world must be met half-way, and then be quickly tackled and pushed back the whole way so that it cannot encroach upon an inch of a young man's career in its cruel, heedless orbit.

England is arranging to look after her millions of temporary

soldiers after the war is over. Their military experience, she justly considers, will, in many cases, render the drudgery of civilian life distasteful. So plantations will probably be subsidized in Australia, and land-grants issued in abundance. Isn't there an obvious hint here to some beneficent legislator that a similar system adopted in pacific America may relieve the young-man-employment problem? The land is here, and the young men in abundance. The war is gradually bringing the festering question to a head. After the war it will probably become too serious to handle without damage to many interests. It is the old question of city attractiveness versus agrarian utility. And it must be answered. Young men, except in isolated instances, will not attempt to answer it. What will their seniors do?

JOHN B. KENNEDY.

The Hermitage of Seraphim

HE who would see and understand Russia as she is and as she was, should not neglect to visit some of the old monasteries such as the Solovetsky on the White Sea, the Petchersky at Kiev, the Seraphimsky at Sarof. In these still remains much of the old contemplative life, and with it many of the traditional mystical ideas of Russia and the Orthodox East. The Seraphimsky, the shrine of Father Seraphim, is one of the most interesting in Russia. It is two or three days' journey from Moscow, some three hundred *versts* by train and then fifty miles by road. I made my visit there one stormy week-end in March. It was full winter; there was not a glimpse of spring. The window sights from the train were all scenes of snow.

The journey by rail lay over treeless wastes and desolate commons, where far-away churches on the snow look like ships sailing under full canvas—very seldom past villages or human beings—to the holy city of Arzamas in the government of Nizhni-Novgorod. A night was spent in an inn among the many churches of Arzamas, and then we traveled by the road across those fifty miles of desolate snow-covered moor that lie between the city and the great monastery.

Today there is bad weather all over Russia. It is ten degrees colder than usual, it still snows, and a high easterly gale is blowing up the fallen snow in blinding clouds that look like engine-smoke and volumes of vapor. A bitter day!

There are no pilgrims on the way, the weather is too heavy for them. Often as you stand and try to go forward over the uneven road the wind sets you sliding backward on the clumps of ice. You come to little villages on the Sarof side of which stand snow-drifts higher than the cottages themselves: they look like cliffs. In the afternoon the snow ceases to fall from the sky, but it still rises in clouds or sprays over the rolling plains. At night I sleep in a peasant's hut, on felt spread on the floor. A whole family goes to sleep in the same room, and as I lie stretched on this primitive couch, each of the others says his prayers before the many ikons. There are many ikons in the room, and besides these, holy oleographs enough to give the idea that the bare wooden walls have been papered with some religious design. Among the pictures there is a representation of the Tsar and Grand Dukes giving their shoulders to the triumphal carrying of the relics of Father Seraphim, on the occasion of the canonization of the Russian hermit.

Father Seraphim was a holy monk and ghostly counselor of the type of Father Sosima, familiar to readers of "The Brothers Karamazof." He is said to have accomplished extraordinary exploits during his youth and middle age, conquering the flesh and denying the world, and in his old age became famous for his sanctity and humility. When he died his body was held in such great veneration that thousands of peasants brought their sick to his tomb. Finally, the Empress, wishing to have a male child, abode at the monastery and prayed, and Father Seraphim, as the peasants tell you, gave Russia a Tsarevitch.

The Tsar then named Seraphim a saint, and the shrine of Sarof gained great ecclesiastical distinction. Hence the oleograph on the wall.

I slept as one sleeps who, after weeks in town, is one day surcharged with open air. Next morning we were up at dawn. A man from the village decided to accompany me to Sarof.

"Haven't been there for four years," said he, "and now I'm homesick to see it again. I think I'll go and pray a little."

We talked of Seraphim on the way.

"Is the cell still there where he fed the bear with bread?" asked I.

"Yes. There is a shrine there now. You'll see the stone where he prayed a thousand days and nights without moving away. And the spring he found is there too. Many people have been cured there. Will you bathe?"

"The weather's cold," said I.

"No one ever takes cold there," said the peasant confidently. "It's quite safe."

When we arrived at the monastery we were accommodated in a cell, and a novice brought in the samovar at once. No passports were required, no charge was made. We found there some three hundred pilgrims most of whom had been there several days, a pleasant collection of churches, hostelries, little shops and work-sheds set on a fair hill among ancient pines. We wandered among the buildings in the dusk, and then returned for a few hours' sleep before the midnight bell to the first service of the morrow. Shortly after midnight we left our cells and followed other pilgrims across the soft new snow to the door of the Cathedral of the Assumption. Then in the witching hour of night we entered the church, such an immense church it seemed, dimly lit by a few struggling tapers, and such a few people in it. The peasants, however, paid no attention to numbers, and they stood and prayed and crossed themselves and gave the responses for hours and hours, at last receiving the blessing of the priest, kissing the cross in his hand, and being marked on the brow with holy water. There was nothing enchanting in the service except the demeanor of the pilgrims, no music worth mentioning. Our leaving our beds to come and stand for hours on the cathedral floor, was a *podvig* (a holy act of self-denial), and *podvig* is an inbred part of the Russian character.

I talked with one of the monks about Father Seraphim. What a character the Russian hermit was: there is material in his life for the pen of another Carlyle writing a new "Past and Present." He was silent for twenty-five years. Alas! no one can tell me the first words he spoke. He was actually silent the whole time that Napoleon was ravaging Russia, during the time when he occupied the holy mother city of Moscow. Napoleon was popularly regarded in Russia as Antichrist, and when the news of the terrible French sacrilege spread over Russia there were all manner of extravagant rumors about the end of the world.

By this time Seraphim had obtained a name for great sanctity. So when Napoleon came to Moscow the crowd appealed to Seraphim to work a "miracle."

"They are burning our sacred shrines," they cried; "they are murdering our priests and pilgrims. Is it naught to the Father?" But Seraphim was silent.

And others said: "He is called Napoleon but he is really Antichrist. Lead us against him in the name of the Lord!"

But Seraphim was silent. His attentive ear seemed to be listening to other voices, his uplifted eyes seemed bent on some unearthly vision. The old monk never spoke a word. Napoleon and the world had no power to interfere with his visions. If Napoleon had come to Sarof and pulled the hermitage down over Seraphim's ears, the old hermit would have prayed on in silence.

He was an extraordinary ascetic, and yet in the picture that you get of him in old age, when he had relaxed his asceticism,

he is distinguished by the warmth of his love. The pilgrims who came to him he called his "joys," and when he gave his benediction he also gave a handful of that dried black bread, *sukaree*, with which he fed Mishenka, the bear that he tamed in the woods.

My pilgrim acquaintance took me to the various shrines, and knelt and kissed the thousand-day stone still standing before the rough-hewn cross that Seraphim made, kissed the ikons, and eventually came to the far shrine where he spent so many years in the wilderness. Here was an aged monk who asked us information as to our Christian names and where we came from. He had a great sack of *sukaree*, and he gave us each a handful with his parting benediction. At the well, or spring, now made into an elaborate bath-house, my pilgrim had a bath. It struck me as rather interesting that the monks of Sarof had fitted a dozen or so taps to Seraphim's natural spring and conducted it through pipes—that is the true ecclesiastical function, to put taps to living water.

I went into the bath-house and watched some peasants stand under the frigid douche, and when my friend had put on his clothes again, without drying himself, we took each a bottle of the water and put it into our pockets.

Then away again from Sarof and home over the snow. I carried the *sukaree* and the water back to a dear old grandmother at Vladikavkaz. Some weeks later when I went back to the Caucasian city I call my Russian home, I took the old lady my gift from the Father. Next day, behold her doling out half-thimbleful of the water to her visitors and giving them a crumb of the comfort of Father Seraphim to eat!

STEPHEN GRAHAM.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters, as a rule, should be limited to six hundred words.

Woman Suffrage

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mrs. Avery in speaking of the family as "the primary form of human government" enters fresh fields into which I am not disposed to follow her. But if she still fancies that warrant can be found in either the Decalogue or the Commandments of the Church for her former assertion, "under the moral law the family, not the individual, is the unit of the State," she needs to be set right. However, I am interested in Mrs. Avery's arguments only in so far as they involve aspersions on Catholics who favor suffrage. To say that a Catholic who considers it politically expedient and just that women shall have the vote, stands "in defiance of the Decalogue," or that such Catholics "scorn Rome and condemn the moral order," is uncharitable. It is more, it is untrue. The disposition on the part of some over-zealous Catholics to find heresy or immorality in views that are not pleasing to them personally is unfortunate, and the Church has suffered much harm and scandal from certain of her children who were more Catholic than the Pope. There is danger that such may be the result of the effort to find heresy and sin in woman suffrage.

New York.

CHARLES O. HAINES.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The question of woman suffrage from the normal male standpoint is merely a question of political expediency. Every voter desires to get "into the band-wagon" in time to have it appear that he had always been there, but I think it will be admitted that the average male voter is afraid of female suffrage for the reason that he does not know what the female voter will do with her ballot. The average voter may even feel that it may be equitable and just to grant woman suffrage, but before voting

for it he will first consider whether it will be politically expedient from his individual viewpoint, i. e., whether it will benefit him, or his pocket-book, or his ambitions, or his business, or his party. The Catholic Church has made no decision as to its morality, so that we may consider woman suffrage as being morally an open question. The only way in which woman suffrage may become a fact is by changing the National Constitution or the various State Constitutions through the votes of the male voters. The only way in which the male voters can be induced to change the Constitution, or Constitutions, is by persuading enough of them that it would be politically expedient. When our republic was organized many of the then States did not have universal male suffrage, but they found afterwards that it would be politically expedient to adopt it. Before the Civil War we did not believe in negro suffrage, but shortly afterwards a majority decided that it would be politically expedient, and we still have it. Any lawyer will admit that there is no legal obstacle to prevent our adopting woman suffrage, provided it is done in the manner provided by the Constitution to carry into execution the will of the male voters.

When the Bull Moose party took up woman suffrage, the Democrats and Republicans immediately feared a large female Progressive vote and decided, mentally, that woman suffrage was unthinkable. In districts where women appear to favor prohibition, the Anti-Prohibitionists are naturally not in favor of woman suffrage. Many men when they see women flocking after every new teacher, healer, mahatma, philosopher, or what-not, will seriously contend that women are not mentally adapted to our scheme of government, just as some contend that the Filipinos will never be capable of self-government. Labor unions carefully see to it that women do not enter into competition with their particular trades, and their ardor for or against woman suffrage is in proportion to their apprehension of personal loss or gain. If the political boss or office-holder thinks he can control his female constituents he will favor woman suffrage, otherwise not. In like manner, many, through personal self-interest or hope of gain, will persuade themselves that unless we adopt woman suffrage the "country will go to the dogs." When the ladies persuade a sufficient number of male voters that woman suffrage is politically expedient, we shall change our Constitutions, we shall have woman suffrage, and mere man will probably be pretending that he has been on the right side from the beginning.

St. Louis.

GEORGE T. DESLOGE.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The difference between the emancipation of woman by the Catholic Church and that proposed by woman suffrage is greater than the distance between the poles; yet Sara McPike's reasoning would make woman's "emancipation" from pagan rule tantamount to degradation to modern paganism. One question makes this clear: From what do suffragists propose to emancipate women? In one phrase, from "priest-craft rule." This answer is not mine only. It is the motive set forth in "The History of Woman Suffrage," which was officially prepared and is officially circulated by the organization. This being so, it is not "an attack upon your opponent's attorney" to set forth the motive of suffragism's academic propaganda and its practical results in terms of Catholic understanding. Does my lady critic desire to be emancipated from "the grasp of the Church upon women"? God forbid!

A "comprehensive knowledge" of radicalism's literature and personnel has made it clear to me that Catholic women need no emancipation, because they are free within the law. It is the unfortunate outsiders who need emancipation from their self-elected emancipators. The Church is the only agent in all this world that has the right and the will to emancipate women from evils of every kind, and I shall listen to Her voice, even though

the devil quote Scripture to his own crafty ends. I have no "impious doubt" that Cæsar will ever prevail over the Church. My concern is that my country shall not be betrayed by its false friends into giving legality to practices that are consistent with false principles of sex independence for husband and wife. If radicals were to have their way, free wives, tandem wives, plural wives and their offspring would have equal civil sanction with the Christian wife and her children. My purpose is to show that woman suffrage, in its spirit and appeal, is anti-Catholic. "Mrs. Avery's reasoning does not lead to the family unit in Turkey, Siam or Timbuctoo." It starts with the monogamic family, the lowest term to which society can be reduced, and it proceeds with the family elevated to a Sacrament by the Lord God. Since the natural order is the foundation for the supernatural order, this should be admitted without cavil to be sound reasoning.

New Zealand is indeed far away. But the socialistic experiments made there are already coming to grief, if one may believe leading radicals who, after a long sojourn in that land, have just returned. It is not the opinion of this or that churchman, but the voice of the Church that is authoritative.

I must decline to discuss a mere denunciation of bad industrial conditions as an argument in favor of votes for women, for Christian men are as badly needed for the reform of commercial life as Christian women for the reform of public opinion. Nor shall I undertake to refute the self-evident error that "the opponents of suffrage are forced to acknowledge that their chief support, both financially and numerically, is furnished by brewers, bummers, gamblers, grafters, white-slavers, and the oppressors of the poor," for a passionate outburst does not, with sensible persons, pass for words of wisdom. Moreover, one word will suffice to deny that "vice or starvation" is the only alternative for millions of women, should "economic independence" fail to arrive in company with political equality. For the road to Christian Democracy has been pointed out by Leo XIII, a road that Catholics may take if they will.

Boston.

MARTHA MOORE AVERY.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The following in dissent from the Avery articles. Here are Mrs. Avery's two syllogisms:

(1) *Whatever doctrine is held by Socialists or feminists is bad doctrine.* But, equal suffrage is held by Socialists and feminists. Therefore, etc. (2) *Whatever impairs the integrity of the family is evil.* But *equal suffrage impairs the integrity of the family.* Therefore, etc.

The italics indicate the premise in each syllogism which carries the heavy burden of proof that Mrs. Avery has not lifted. We know that Socialists support equal suffrage. Such support does not reflect on the morality of suffrage as much as the support of brewers and saloonkeepers hurts the cause of anti-suffrage. Socialists like theories, saloonkeepers like results. Again, it is clearer that the breakup of family ties is fatal to society than that equal suffrage will break down those ties. The lady's ammunition is wasted in establishing what all Catholics admit.

To illustrate the first error: Candid people of all beliefs admit that Socialism as a political force is not wholly bad; Socialists complain that other parties steal their thunder by adopting some of their ideas. They are adopted because they are not necessarily socialistic, and are good. We smile at the political diagnosis which makes "capitalism" the fountain of all human ills, but we do not smile at the human ills! Socialist pens and tongues have painted human suffering well and powerfully. So much of Socialism is good, and no power on earth can make it bad. As well say that we should despise human suffering because Socialists are concerned for it, as despise equal suffrage because Socialists support it! The suffrage idea is not logically connected with the Socialist idea, nor repugnant to the individualist

idea. It is simply a weapon which Socialists believe in using. So do I.

Then there is the integrity of the family, may its shadow never grow less! Here again the heavy guns are aimed at the obvious. Nobody wants the family disrupted. I fear that much less than some other things. I live in a small town where whiskey and prostitution work constantly for the corruption of youth. About half the good citizens (male) want these things to go, and go quickly, and the other half dimly feel that they are wrong, and yet vote to keep them established. Vice holds the balance of power, and the rest is easy, that is, *did* hold the balance of power. Now that the women of this State are enfranchised, we have greater hope, because, although women are in their infancy as political units, still they seem to vote right whenever decency and cleanness are the issues. By the way, Mrs. Avery, what do you believe concerning those two respectable institutions, the liquor traffic and prostitution? . . . Few good women can write as well as you, but every one of them could vote as well! Why do you say that a mother may pray for her son to escape corruption, but if she votes for his welfare, she is breaking family ties? She may teach him that gambling is the destroyer of youth, but if she votes for law-enforcement, she is shattering society! She may teach purity in the nursery, but may not vote to abolish the den of vice three blocks away!

Such opposition to suffrage is dying, if not dead. Female intelligence and honesty, as well as male, are entitled to their due share of influence, at least as a measure of expediency, are entitled, in the fine phrase of the Constitution, to the "equal protection of the laws."

Dillon, Montana.

HARLOW PEASE.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

It is quite clear that Mrs. Avery does not believe in the sincerity of the suffrage movement, nor in the intelligence of those who do. It is difficult to follow with any degree of satisfaction her flights of language, or to trace any very close connection between the question of "Votes for Women" and many of the things that she discusses. Mrs. Avery disclaims any "distortion of the facts," yet she says: "Isn't it a marvel that a Catholic woman can be found who considers 1,000,000 New York women and 540,000 voting men proof of a just cause?" This is clearly a distortion of what I wrote. The figures given above were cited merely as statistics, not as "proof of a just cause." On the contrary, if the principle of woman suffrage is right and only one woman in the country wants to vote, she should not be denied that privilege; whereas if the principle is wrong, and every woman in the country were clamoring for it, no women should be allowed to vote. While, then, the fact that 1,000,000 women in New York State believe in woman suffrage and 540,000 men (to be more correct, 553,000 men) voted for it, is no "proof of a just cause," it is a very good argument in favor of suffrage; because it proves exactly what suffragists claim, that the votes of men, even on this question, which most closely touches the interests of women, do not represent the opinions of women; otherwise there would have been at least 1,000,000 votes cast in favor of suffrage. That number would have carried the amendment.

Mrs. Avery says that the movement "emphatically denies that the family is a moral body with the man at the head of the family government." It does nothing of the kind. Individuals in or out of the movement may do so, but the movement does not. To my mind the ideal family is that with one head composed of two persons, each the complement of the other, and both united in love, fidelity and devotion to God, each other, the family and the home. Each, however, possesses a separate soul, mind, conscience, will; each is responsible to the other, to the family, to the home, to society, and to God. It is in the capacity of a responsible member of society, not from opposition

to the family as the unit of society, but because of a proper interest in the laws governing society and influencing the family, either collectively or in its members, that every woman, be she wife, mother, sister or daughter, should wish to become an active force in the regulation of affairs pertaining to government.

Mrs. Avery says that the woman suffrage movement is "one of the most skilful assaults upon the Faith that the world has ever witnessed"; that the "justification" that it is an anti-Catholic idea is plain enough; that it is a "movement which defends divorce, birth control and the like." To say these things is utterly ridiculous, it is worse, because such statements are not only untrue, they cast discredit on a perfectly worthy cause, the only aim of which is to extend equal justice, equal protection, and equal representation to all citizens, irrespective of sex, and thus make our Government what it ought to be, a real democracy. Mrs. Avery refuses to see in woman suffrage anything but Socialism, anarchy, and irreligion. I have been personally assured by some of the most representative and respected priests of this city of their hearty approval and support of woman suffrage. Three of these priests I have known since my childhood; one was my confessor for years; all are dear personal friends. I have letters from two very eminent priests whose names are known and respected throughout the city, one has an even wider reputation, commending my interest in the cause. If there was the slightest doubt in my mind as to the worthiness of the cause or as to its character when judged from a religious or moral standpoint, and I had to choose between the opinions of these gentlemen and those of Mrs. Avery, whose views on several subjects have been from time to time more or less erratic, I should not hesitate for one moment as to whose advice and counsel were the more valuable.

The whole sense and spirit of the woman suffrage movement is summed up in the Susan B. Anthony Amendment now before the Congress of the United States: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied nor abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." Since, then, Mrs. Avery's idea of the suffrage movement is not the suffrage movement at all, in other words, since we cannot agree as to a definition of terms, further discussion is futile.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

AGNES HULL PRENDERGAST.

[This controversy is closed.—Editor AMERICA.]

Rational Athletics

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I be allowed to bring the controversy with Mr. Shortall to an end, at least so far as I am concerned, by extending to him a cordial invitation to visit Public School 33, The Bronx? There he will see boys and girls getting an excellent training in the calisthenic work which he so eloquently describes, and in addition learning the rudiments of several wholesome outdoor athletic sports, which they can and do follow outside of school. Seeing is believing; and I am confident that a man of Mr. Shortall's experience will readily see the wisdom of giving our boys and girls not only formal, corrective, and educational drills, but also rational training in athletics, not for the few, but for all.

New York.

FREDERICK J. REILLY.

[This controversy is closed.—Editor AMERICA.]

Joseph Conrad's Religious Belief

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the English "Catholic Who's Who," Conrad is set down as a Catholic. The sketches in "Who's Who" are, I believe, autobiographical; at any rate, for obvious reasons they are pretty safe guides.

New York.

J. A. L.

A M E R I C A

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1916

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, JOHN D. WHEELER.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00 (16s.)

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 88d Street, New York City, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Contributions for the Mexican fund may be sent direct to AMERICA.

Dr. Carroll's Census Again

MANY a great man is poor at figures. Falstaff, for instance, even allowing for the trepidation of the moment, fell into grievous mathematical error when counting the men in buckram, and Dogberry, genial soul, was but imperfectly acquainted with the Ordinal Numerals. Dr. H. K. Carroll, the author of a religious census annually given to an expectant world, betrays a genius singularly akin to these immortals. Dr. Carroll has long dwelt with statistics. To his mighty intellect, the subtlest processes of addition, multiplication and particularly subtraction, are as familiar as war to a Belgian. But familiarity has bred the inevitable contempt. That deep reverence for a primal mathematical fact, expressed by the Bowery poet in the touching couplet:

Every little bit, added to what you've got,
Makes just a little bit more,

and cherished by ordinary folk whose highest mathematical flights are achieved by the aid of an adding-machine, awakens no responsive chord in Dr. Carroll's stony bosom. For he knows that the added "little bit" may make "just a little bit less," and that when there is question of counting Catholics, it invariably does. In mathematics as applied to Catholics, addition is equivalent to subtraction.

Take John and Mary Smith, for example. To tell John that he and his wife are not Catholics, might imperil life, and as John's claim is admitted even by Dr. Carroll, it may be taken as an indisputable fact. But what of that "little bit" of humanity which God has sent them, and for which at the earliest moment they have secured the Sacrament of Baptism? These ignorant people cherish a belief, shared by the equally ignorant

Catholic Church, that by reason of its Baptism, this "little bit" is just as much of a Catholic as His Holiness, Pope Benedict XV, now gloriously reigning. But Dr. Carroll knows better. It belongs to him, not to the Catholic Church, to define what constitutes membership in the Catholic Church. The first and indispensable requisite is "age." Baptism does not count. The baby may turn into a Catholic in after years or it may not; at present, it is not a Catholic, simply because it is a baby. Thus, whatever frivolous notions Catholics may entertain touching the requisites for membership in their small, ignorant and inconsiderable body, are blown aside as chaff before the fan of Dr. Carroll's astounding and somewhat impertinent dogmatism.

Yet even with the Boston *Transcript* to stand sponsor, it is difficult to take Dr. Carroll and his demathematized figures with any degree of seriousness. This is somewhat of a pity, for the industrious Dr. Carroll regards himself very seriously indeed. Every year, he counts the Catholics of the United States with conscientious care. From the result, he deducts fifteen per cent. Let no fanatic chide him. He is following, strictly and conscientiously, the principle known to all mathematicians, that the sum of two plus two is four, minus fifteen per cent.

Dangerous Generosity

HAPPILY a new source of journalistic merriment has recently been found. A man, in one of our smaller American cities, was detained by the police on suspicion of insanity. The reason alleged by the papers was that he had deposited a five-dollar bill on the collection plate during church services.

There are, doubtless, instances enough where, judging merely by antecedents, such excess of generosity might well give rise to serious suspicion and rightly cause disquietude within certain circles. On the other hand, the wasteful expenditures incurred by the same individuals in satisfying their costly habits or inordinate passions, and in assuring the attendance of their wives and daughters at questionable plays and amusements would be considered entirely normal.

There are Catholics—present readers always excepted—whose tables are littered with secular literature, but who are too poor to subscribe to Catholic journals or magazines, of which they in particular stand in great need. There are others so burdened with the multitudinous demands of parish interests and Catholic charities, to which they seldom pay any practical attention, that they cannot afford to remember the foreign missions or any of the other larger needs of the Church. Not a few even are so absorbed in religious services, when of necessity they must attend them, that they become wholly oblivious of the very passing of the collection-box in its distracting round before them or else, absent-mindedly, draw a widow's mite from their pros-

perous purses and generously deposit it with the comforting feeling that they have done their duty for another week.

When such a state of mind has become habitual, it is evident that reasons for serious suspicions would exist, should such people suddenly manifest unexpected symptoms of generosity in matters pertaining to the cause of Christ. However, they can escape the inquisitive scrutiny of an alienist, should nothing worse befall them, by following the admonition of Our Divine Lord: "But when thou dost give alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doth. That thy alms may be in secret: and thy Father who seeth in secret will repay thee." This warning in mind, they can safely enter on a new course of munificent generosity in the service of Christ. Retrenching from their former wastefulness in purely secular matters would render such a course easy.

Mothers and "Movies"

THE modern child, it would seem, chooses his own amusements. Time was when these were as carefully supervised by his mother, as his clothes, his food, his health, and his moral training. But that was back in the gloom of the nineteenth century, and this is the twentieth. The modern mother of the modern child has many absorbing interests; teas, clubs, societies to supply the Ethiopians with pen-wipers, the working girl with an altered social outlook, and the wintry wind-swept cab-horse with a new blanket. She cannot be expected to neglect these important occupations for such trifling incidentals as children, a husband, and a home. Her sacred duty lies in broader fields.

The Catholic mother is not a modern mother; she cannot be and remain a Catholic, save in name. But even within the circle of Catholic mothers, some negligence is observable. There are amusements on all sides for children; parks, playgrounds, municipal dancing floors, and the ubiquitous moving-picture. All may be a source of danger if not properly conducted; particularly the cheap and popular "movie." Despite the cant of the trade, "movies" are made, not to educate, not to "uplift," but to pay a return on capital invested. Their obvious possibilities for evil have not been left unexploited by many producers, and such censorship as has been forced upon this commercial enterprise is worth very little. The meaning of "Passed by the National Board of Censors," for instance, may be ascertained on reading the Board's report for 1914. The Board announces, with something of an air of virtue, that it "prohibits vulgarity when it offends, or when it verges on indecency," but allows it to remain if "an adequate moral purpose is served."

Just when vulgarity is *not* offensive, or how in an exhibition open to the public, children included, it can serve "an adequate moral purpose," the Board does not explain. Catholic parents, however, particularly mothers, should note the danger to which, by the very admission of the

Board, their children are subjected, and take measures accordingly. A most efficient measure would be the establishment of a vigorous local censorship. Chicago, for example, does not hesitate to impose ruthless "cut-outs" in films accepted by censors of flexible moral standards. If universally followed, Chicago's example would convince the producers that vulgarity, although it may impress a deep moral lesson, as a commercial proposition, is a "dead loss."

That Blessed Word "Preparedness"!

CALLING on ten years' experience as a journalist, Mr. Simeon Strunsky concludes an article on "Preparedness" in this month's *Bookman* with the following analysis of our "national psychology":

In philosophical terminology we are a nation of monists. We believe in a single principle, the principle, the formula, the fad, of the moment. Is it Eugenics? Is it Boy Scouts? Is it the Recall? Is it Commission Form of Municipal Government? Is it Conservation? Every sect and every interest seizes its own meaning. As a result we have, not only the conservation of forests, but the conservation of democracy, conservation of infant life, conservation of labor unions, conservation of America's merchant marine. Is it scientific management? Then it is the scientific management of forests, mines, government, schools, children, marriage, literature, play, saloons, what not. This passion for the popular trademark is at work in the case of Preparedness. We need Preparedness for army and navy, but also, if you read the newspapers, preparedness in the factories, on the railroads, in the schools, in the courts, in Congress, in municipal government, in the prisons. We must prepare by building roads just as we had to build roads in the name of Conservation, prepare by building up a merchant marine, prepare by establishing rural credits, and wiping out hook-worm.

The idea behind each of the above catchwords, it will be noted, is practically the same. So an overworked "copy-maker" only needs to read again the articles that the last decade's reviews and magazines have had about "uplift," "efficiency," "conservation," "the recall," or "eugenics," and he will find ready at hand all the platitudes, examples and arguments that are required for the production of a "thoughtful and timely" paper on preparedness: paste, scissors and a blue pencil will represent the main equipment that the scribe himself must bring to his task. For the identical historical instances can be used to drive home the lessons of preparedness that were employed to prove the value of "efficiency," the beauty of "uplift," and the wisdom of "conservation." Tamerlane, for example, never could have erected those pyramids of hostile skulls, for which he is notorious, unless he had been as firm a believer in preparedness as he was in efficiency; Hildebrand could hardly have achieved so brilliantly the great object of his Pontificate, unless he had been as devoted to preparedness as he was to uplift; Napoleon could not have waged so long a war unless his zeal for preparedness had equaled his passion for conservation.

On the other hand, Nero's neglect of preparedness had

as much to do with his own ruin as had his profound indifference to uplift; Ponce de Leon's tardy quest for preparedness of the most vital kind failed to make up for his early ignorance of conservation's necessity; and Marie Antoinette's deplorable blindness to the need of preparedness was equaled only by her husband's lamentable lack of efficiency. Thus can that blessed word "preparedness" be made a hook on which to hang yards and yards of marketable "copy," until a new slogan is sounded, as sounded it will be, under which can be marshaled the same venerable arguments and instances that are now advanced for preparedness.

Dogberry in Boston

WITH sore heart and hurt emotions, but spoiling for a fight, the dramatic critic of the *Boston Transcript* sat himself down to pen his impressions of the art and sad persecution of M. Diaghileff and the *Ballet Russe*. Monsieur had been rudely handled in New York, isle of barbarians. Monsieur had protested, with appropriate gesture, in the sacred name of liberty, of liberty prostrate, of liberty bleeding as bleeding Kansas had bled. But Monsieur had been informed that not even in Art, may license be suffered to pose as liberty. At least, not in New York.

With this strange and marvelous lesson half-learned, M. Diaghileff with his artists and *artistes*, his press-agent, his business-manager, and, lastly, his Art, repaired to Boston. Surely, thought he, in this Athens of the western world, afflicted though it be with *canaille* of Irish extraction, Art lives, Art is welcomed, Art is remunerated, and profits are large. But no. Even in Boston, "particularly in Boston" would be an apter phrase, Art must yield to a policeman, possibly Irish, with a large club, when Art assumes the soiled garb of license.

With these memories running riot, our scribe seizes his pen. To Mayor Curley and his representatives at the Opera House, he ascribes motives of lubricity, quite unknown, of course, to himself and the white-souled throng who had paid a price to gaze upon "artistic" semi-nudity. What can the rabble, personified by the Mayor, know of the purity which enshrines the souls of dramatic critics and plastic artists? that hangs as a halo over Sir Galahad, the business-manager, whose soul burns with the clear, even flame of devotion to Art and the proceeds of the box-office? Nothing. And the law? The wrath of our dramatic critic, as he ponders upon the law, is as a furnace seven times heated; it rises, as heated atmosphere must rise; it flames. "The law is law," says the *Transcript* of Boston, "and sometimes, as Dogberry observed, 'it is also an ass.'"

Alas, for Boston and the *Transcript*, stickler for the proprieties in Art and literature! Search your "Oliver Twist," brother, and when found make a note on't. But O that Dogberry—"as pretty a piece of flesh as any is in

Messina: and one that knows the law,"—should be written down as that merest of beadles, Mr. Bumble! And in Boston too, and "which is more" by that wise fellow, the dramatic critic of the *Boston Transcript*!

Four Cruel Tasks

NOWADAYS when so many investigations are afoot for the relief of the overworked, underpaid, down-trodden, and oppressed, the pitiable condition of Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school teachers should be brought to the public's attention. These worthy men and women are being subjected to intolerable hardships. For according to the instructions contained in an authoritative Episcopalian periodical, called *Teachers' Helps*, those who undertake Sunday-school work are expected to accomplish satisfactorily the following impossible tasks:

I—Show that the English Reformation was the work of the Church, not the State. II—Show that the English Church is not [at?] all indebted to Henry VIII for her Reformation. III—Show how the Roman Catholic Queen Mary made England Protestant. IV—Show that the great English reformers were martyrs, and the Continental reformers died in their beds.

As it is clear that all attempts to prove these four propositions cannot but seriously imperil the moral and intellectual well-being of both teachers and pupils, it would seem that there are just grounds for at once appointing a board of commissioners to investigate the case. For those Sunday-school instructors must first convince themselves, and then their hearers, that the English Parliament of 1534 did not transfer to Henry VIII, at his command, the powers of the Pope, and did not declare the King "the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England." With base ingratitude to the royal Bluebeard, they next have to prove that even if Parliament had not passed at the King's behest the Act of Supremacy, the English Reformation nevertheless would have taken place.

Thirdly, those unhappy teachers must prove beyond all cavil that when Queen Mary married a Catholic prince, reconciled her subjects with the Holy See, had worthy bishops consecrated and did her best to stamp out heresy, she was manifestly making England a stanch Protestant land. But the really Herculean task is the fourth, for the harried instructors must not only demonstrate to admiration that a martyr is one who lays down his life in defense of heretical tenets, but they must also prove from authentic historical documents, that Henry VIII, the founder of English Protestantism, and Edward VI, and Elizabeth, the zealous promoters of the new religion, suffered a violent death owing to the Papists' hatred of the Reformation. Without question a commission should be appointed to examine the condition of Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school teachers, and to take prompt measures, if need be, for their relief. The work of such a commission would be watched with interest.

LITERATURE

Shelley and Byron

SHELLEY'S fame as a poet is secure, and will remain secure so long as our language is read and appreciated, for assuredly no man, not even Shakespeare, ever made so magnificent a use of that language as an instrument of music or a medium of passionate emotion. No man ever came so near to expressing the inexpressible by the mere power that words have of transcending their own meaning. His position as a seer is still disputed, and will be until time shows whether that gospel which he so powerfully preached and which has so powerfully influenced our age is a true human faith or an aberration.

To compare Shelley and Byron is inevitable, for not only were they the two voices proclaiming on the morrow of the victory of the kings that the Revolution had been conquered too late, but the point at which the two diverged was that at which our age swerved aside from the robust common sense of the original revolutionary creed, seeking newer and stranger gods. Both were accused in their day of impiety. In both cases, and especially in the case of Shelley, there has been a tendency in later years not merely to absolve them, but to hold them up as better Christians than their accusers. The real and vital distinction between them has yet to be made.

There was nothing particularly heterodox about Byron. He loved justice and hated iniquity, but there is nothing unorthodox about that. He hated the artificial aristocracy structure of the society in which he lived, and he continually and vigorously attacked it. He had an irresponsible sense of humor and when a blasphemous or ribald joke occurred to him he uttered it, as many ordinary European men do, though they utter such jokes in the smoking room, while his words echoed throughout Europe. But, except perhaps in the crudity of early youth, he had no quarrel with the common morals or religion of Christendom. His own life was what the lives of most of the young aristocrats of that age were, and often are still. He never defended it, or pretended that it arose from the exquisite superiority of his soul. He knew very well that it arose from human temptation, from human weakness and sin. In religion he grew more and more orthodox, as his years increased. Had he lived ten years longer he would have been a Catholic. In his private letters he almost says as much.

That is what the Socialist Marx meant when he said that it was well that Byron died young, for had he lived he would have become a "reactionary." If Marx meant by "reactionary" anti-democrat, he was wrong. There is no trace of any such change visible in his writings or in his letters; his zeal for liberty grows stronger until at the end he gives his life for it at Missolonghi. But Marx was right in a way. Byron *would* have got more and more alienated from what is called "modern thought," as its advanced guard moved more and more in Shelley's direction. "He is to my knowledge," he says of Shelley in a letter to Moore, "the least selfish and the mildest of men. . . . With his speculative opinions I have nothing in common nor desire to have."

For Shelley really was in revolt not merely against accidental oppression or the corruption of a particular society, but against things that Europeans had thought necessary to any society, against the nation, against the family, against the faith. It is quite curious how Shelley united in himself all those fads which have nothing whatever to do with the plain dogma of democracy, which are in some cases rather antagonistic to it, yet which our age has come to associate in some vague way with what is called being "progressive." He was a free lover, a pacifist, a vegetarian, a teetotaler. The history of his religious opinions almost rehearses the history of the last century, beginning in a boyish

Materialism and ending in that kind of Oriental Pantheism in which modern thought in Protestant countries seems likely to lose itself. Those who are anxious to prove Shelley a Christian *malgré lui* often insist on this change. They are wrong. Shelley was much less a Christian when he wrote "Epipsychidion" than when he wrote "Queen Mab."

Now that distinction having been made, there are certain very interesting consequences to be noted. One is this: while Shelley is much the more universally revolutionary of the two poets in theory, Byron is much the more vigorously revolutionary in practice. Byron threw himself enthusiastically into the struggle for the liberation of Greece. He even rejoiced over the exploits of the frame-breakers and the Luddites in England, and declared that if there was any prospect of a real row he would return to his native land. Shelley, on the other hand, never spoke of the French Revolution without maudlin tears over its violence. His ideas of how a revolution should be conducted will be found in "The Masque of Anarchy." To him a revolution would seem to be rather like a parlor game or a lawn party!

As Shelley grew older, he seems to have grown to care less and less for the demand for immediate social or political justice. The reason is not far to seek. In his youth indeed he was, it would appear, possessed by the most astounding ignorance of how men and women feel about things, an ignorance only possible to one who was at once a recluse and an aristocrat. Such ignorance is exemplified in the proposal he made to his wife, a proposal the grotesque indecency of which is almost redeemed by its ingenuousness, that she should come and spend a pleasant holiday with him and the woman he had run away with. But time must have taught him something. He must have seen that while men might rise for obvious justice, they would not rise for his ideal. They were much more liable to rise against it, and fiercely cry it down.

Shelley was so wonderful a poet and so enthusiastic a revolutionist that it is curious at first sight that all his revolutionary poetry should be so bad. No man of his genius ever had less gift for invective or protest. Read his lines to Eldon: I quote the two strongest stanzas:

By thy most killing sneer, and by thy smile,
By all the snares and nets of thy black den;
And—for thou canst outweep the crocodile—
By thy false tears—those millstones braining men.

I curse thee, though I hate thee not, O slave!
If thou couldst quench the earth-consuming Hell
Of which thou art the demon, on thy grave
This curse should be a blessing. Fare thee well!

How weak it all is! Note the priggish falsehood, "I curse thee though I hate thee not." And then turn to some of those lines like sharp sword-blades with which Byron hews in pieces the men and institutions that he hated. Here again I think that the same explanation applies. Shelley was at home in the cloud-land of his vision, and he painted it in colors that will never die. But, though clouds are eminently picturesque, they form a poor emplacement for a battery of artillery.

That vague denial of necessary things which Shelley did so much to popularize among revolutionists will not last. Even the rich are tiring of it; to the poor it will always be unmeaning. But when it is gone, Shelley will remain. When the whole of this bewildering time shall have become to a saner age something meaningless and almost half-witted, men will still feel their hearts moved strangely by "The West Wind," or that wonderful chorus beginning "Life of Life! my lips enkindle." The temple of incomparable beauty which his hands raised will stand in the midst of the desert of dead and forgotten things, like that colossal statue of Ozymandias in one of his superb poems.

Cecil Chesterton.

REVIEWS

Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery down to the Time of Innocent III. By REGINALD L. POOLE, Hon. Litt.D. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$2.75.

The author of this book, long engaged in the British Museum, has made Papal documents a special study. Called to the University of Oxford to lecture on matters connected with diplomacy, he reduced the knowledge acquired during many years to form. In 1912 he was elected Birkbeck Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History by Trinity College, Cambridge. This gave him the opportunity of improving and extending his work which now is given to the public. The work is purely technical; and anyone going to it for pleasant stories about Roman corruption will be disappointed. It deals with the foundation of the Chancery in the notaries of the third century, and discusses the relations between the ecclesiastical regions of Rome and those established by Augustus. It tells of the development of the Chancery, the establishment of its officers as time went on; the beginnings and the evolution of Bulls, their internal structure and how this changed from age to age, the ways of distinguishing true Bulls from false, the means used especially by Innocent III to prevent forgery, and such like things. Perhaps the chapter on the *Ars Dictandi* and the *Cursus Curie* is the most interesting in the book. We learn among other things, that in the beginning of the twelfth century John of Gaeta, Chancellor of the Roman Church and afterwards Pope Gelasius II, brought back "the style of ancient grace and elegance in the Apostolic See, which was almost lost, and the Leonine rhythm with its lucid rapidity." Our author does not see the reason why the ancient *cursus* is here termed "Leonine." St. Leo the Great, to whom the Holy See has always looked as to one of its most splendid lights, is remarkable among the Fathers for the beauty of his style and the care with which he constructed his cadences. One reading a page of his, will find exemplified all the rules laid down by Albert of Morra toward the end of the twelfth century in the *cursus* that, because he became Pope Gregory VIII, was called the "Gregorian." May we not then conclude that the work begun by the former chancellor and continued by the latter, had for its foundation the style of St. Leo; and thus explain the origin of the term, "Leonine"? H. W.

Manuale di Teosofia. GIOVANNI BUSNELLI, S.J. Parte iii. Cosmologia e antropologia teosofica. Seconda Editione. 2 lire. Parte iv. La reincarnazione. Seconda Editione accresciuta. 2.50 lire. Roma: *Civiltà Cattolica*.

The completion of the second edition of Father Busnelli's studies in theosophy is evidence of a need due to the vogue of these non-Christian ideas in Italy. The chief authorities on theosophy are quite familiar to the writer. The difference between the theosophical ideas of Mrs. Besant and Rudolph Steiner are pointed out and explained. Mrs. Besant was unnerved by the dangerous sickness of her daughter, and conceived a sickening hatred of God for what she deemed His lack of mercy. Later that daughter became a Catholic, and the mother's hatred of Christianity waxed stronger. She is now an out-and-out Buddhist; her potential could scarcely register more vehement attraction to Buddha nor more virulent revulsion against Christ. In her system there is no effort to make Jesus out to have been a Buddhist. The case of Steiner is otherwise. He retains for Christianity an affection that is due to early training, for he is a priest. And so we find Steiner trying to make Jesus a Buddhistic mystic, and Christianity a mystic fact quite compatible with Buddhism. The incompatibility, however, is clearly demonstrated by Father Busnelli.

Sometimes Catholics are drawn to the vague, mystifying,

theosophic idea of the evolution of the macrocosm, i. e., the universe, and the microcosm, i. e., man. The idea of reincarnation, for instance, appeals to them. Is it not very like our Catholic idea of the resurrection of the body? By no means, for, in the first place, the resurrection of the body is revealed truth; whereas the theosophic reincarnation of man is fancied twaddle. Secondly, the body which, in Catholic doctrine, is to rise again is the same body that now lives; whereas the reincarnation of theosophic Karma is not a reincarnation at all. Theosophic conception takes place without any transmigration. When a candle is used to light another, that candle does not transmigrate into the other. In like manner, the body that is reincarnated does not transmigrate into another. That is a very strange system of incarnation, and yet it is the theosophic one. W. F. D.

Mother Goose: the Volland Edition. Arranged and Edited by EULALIE OSGOOD GROVER. Illustrated by FREDERICK RICHARDSON. Chicago: P. F. Volland & Co. \$2.00.

"The present edition of 'Mother Goose' preserves the best of the verses which became so popular in England and America as to first demand their publication," explains the editor in her foreword. The text followed is that of the London edition of 1791 and the Boston edition of 1833, so some of the familiar nursery rhymes usually attributed to Mother Goose, such as "Who Killed Cock Robin?" and "The House That Jack Built," are missing. The way a number of the lines in this "only truly classic edition that has been published in modern times" differs from certain spurious readings that now enjoy a wide vogue is very interesting. For example, that cobweb-sweeping old woman does not gently ascend "in a basket," but is violently "tossed in a blanket," and that St. Ives man, who had multiplied his wives so scandalously, disappears altogether, for the authentic reading is "I met seven wives," each woman having presumably but one husband, though she still retains the time-honored complement of sacks, cats, and kittens. So the ethical value of the verses is considerably heightened. It is gratifying to note that "Hush-a-bye-Baby, upon the Tree Top," fearlessly maintains the inexorable character of the law of gravity, though a "denatured" edition of "Mother Goose," which appeared a year or two ago, altered the last two lines of that lullaby because they were thought too ruthless and shocking for a modern child to hear, and the richly merited punishment meted out to that irreligious old man who refused to pray was doubtless considered wholly out of keeping with the spirit of our enlightened age.

But what gives this classic edition of the nursery rhymes its chief value are the 108 beautiful full-page illustrations, fine reproductions in color of Frederick Richardson's original paintings, which could hardly be much improved in conception or in execution. The book is so sumptuous indeed, that most children will be allowed to look at it, in all probability, only while mother turns the leaves, though the privilege of perusing the volume alone might well be made the guerdon of unusually angelical conduct. Our little ones would certainly make possessions forever of many pictures in this volume, particularly the illustrations the artist has made for "Bah, Bah, Black Sheep," "About the Bush, Willie," "Jack Spratt," "Little Miss Muffet," "The Old Woman Who Lived in a Shoe," "Little Jack Horner," and dozens of other rhymes. W. D.

India and Its Faiths: a Traveler's Record. By JAMES BISSETT PRATT, Ph.D. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co. \$4.00.

Professor Pratt has given in this volume an interesting account of the origin, development and present state of the religions of India. At this time, when that country is drawing the attention of the rest of the world, because of the growing spirit of unrest reported there, the book should prove of special

value, as it also describes many local customs and happenings which are not purely religious. The author views the various religions of India from the standpoint of a student of the history and psychology of religion. He is an impartial observer of all religious systems, and has personally, if we may judge from his writings, no conviction of the exclusive truth of any religion. He seems to lean toward a universal pantheistic religion, and hence, is full of sympathy for the many good points in India's faiths which he presents to the reader in this volume. Mohammed, Zoroaster and Buddha he classes together with Christ, and offensively compares the grotesque elements of the Hindu religions with Christian symbolism. Bathing in the Ganges to rid oneself of sin he likens to Christian baptism and takes several flings at the Catholic Church. As the author's story is a traveler's account it is somewhat sketchy. It is to be regretted that he did not digest more fully the abundance of matter he collected. Some important beliefs and customs are mentioned only incidentally, and the explanation of certain terms is sought for in vain. The volume is well illustrated, and a good index is furnished.

H. J. P.

Mysteries of the Mass in Reasoned Prayers. By Father W. ROCHE, S.J. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$0.50.

Those who use this little book should find in it valuable aids to devotion while assisting at the Holy Sacrifice. In broken lines that are meant to facilitate the use of the Ignatian third method of prayer are arranged the author's apposite reflections on the various portions of the Mass, so that the worshiper can both follow the priest and meditate on the words of the Missal. This passage from the *In propria venit* of St. John's Gospel, for example, indicates how Father Roche supplies communicants with suitable thanksgiving thoughts:

Thou art come, Lord Jesus, into my house, the house of my soul. I adore, I worship, I welcome Thee. Thou art come as long ago into the house of Thy friends, the two sisters, at Bethany, where Martha did try to entertain Thee and Mary sat in silence at Thy feet. Thou didst approve the silent one more than the other. Therefore for awhile I too will kneel silent in Thy presence, and not obtrude my words on Thee, nor busy myself with many acts, nor play the host to Thee as to a stranger. Rather art Thou the Host and Master and I Thy guest, since Thou dost provide the banquet and the house belongs to Thee.

The Divine Mysteries of Mercy, Revelation, Sacrifice, and Union, as manifested in the Holy Sacrifice, suggest the order of Father Roche's reflections, the pages on the Preface of the Mass being particularly good.

W. D.

What Is a Christian? By JOHN WALKER POWELL. New York The Macmillan Co. \$1.00.

The author of this book might be called impartial if his extensive bibliography included half-a-dozen eminent Catholic authorities, and if the body of his argument accorded anything like proportionate consideration to the mind of the largest, oldest and best-united Christian organization in existence. Mr. Powell's argument is frankly practical rather than technical, his aim being "to help the man on the street to clear up his thinking" by examining the recorded teachings of Christ in the light of what the author understands to be their historical interpretation. This task he discharges with a combination of reverence and practical wisdom which is as commendable as it is rare. But the good seed, as soon as it is sprung up, withers away, for the hard rock of unconscious prejudice lies but a few inches beneath the surface. True, Mr. Powell's practice is usually better than his theory. Two of his chapters, "The Christian and War" and "The Christian and Wealth," are well worth reading. Here he presents to his readers the very attitude of the Catholic Church upon the subjects in question. His findings, however,

instead of being ascribed to the proper source, are attributed to "sanctified common sense."

The remainder of the book abounds in errors of the most serious nature. In general it maintains a contrast between a fancied orthodoxy and something saner which the modern world "has come to understand." Had the vast and united Catholic body been given a fair hearing, Mr. Powell would have discovered a strong majority of Christians who are in the van of moral and social progress precisely because they "understand" Christ just as His Apostles understood Him. If the author really wishes to "clear up the thinking" of his readers and himself alike, he would do well to consider seriously the only interpretation of Christianity which is truly and continuously historic; and, furthermore, he would do well to draw his information of the Church's mind from her own authorized teachers, and not from superficial philosophy and falsified history.

W. H. McC.

The Art of the Moving Picture. By VACHEL LINDSAY. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$1.25.

Making the Movies. Illustrated by ERNEST A. DENCH. The Macmillan Co. \$1.25.

Nowadays, according to Jaques, (revised) "All the world's a screen," and the public's interest in moving-picture-making is so keen that books bearing on various phases of the industry are already quite numerous. The author of "The Art of the Moving Picture" has great faith in the film as a corrective for the saloon and he is looking forward to the day when there will be in every community endowed motion-picture halls where "massive and classical treatises, imperial chronicles, law-codes, traditions and religious admonitions" will be the subject-matter of what is thrown on the screen. He well observes that just now the actor and managers of the "movies" are "engaged in a financial orgy" and are immersing the helpless public in a "sea of unharnessed photography: sloppy conceptions set forth with sharp edges and irrelevant realism," and containing little that is artistic. For no "Doric restraint" is exercised, but much that is offensive and demoralizing is presented. Among the remedies Mr. Lindsay suggests for this state of things is starting "conversational theaters" where the spectators discuss the pictures with one another and at the end of an hour's entertainment hand the manager leaflets on which are written their opinion of the films they have just seen. When the author speaks on page 273 of a "Modernist Catholic," is he not using a contradiction in terms? In "Making the Movies" Mr. Dench supplies curious readers with a quantity of ill-arranged information about the way the wonderful effects they see on the screen are produced.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

"The Whitaker Almanac and Encyclopedia" has long been to Englishmen what a book like "The World Almanac" is to us. But this year an "American Whitaker" (Macmillan, \$1.00), devoted almost exclusively to the United States, has been published for the first time. The volume contains considerable information not found in other books of the kind and devotes some twenty-five closely-written pages to a review of the war during 1915. It would not be hard to find better maps than those inserted in this book.—In "Les Paroles de la Guerre" (Paris, Téqui, 3 fr. 50), Mgr. Gauthey, Archbishop of Besançon, has put together the more important of his addresses to his flock, and the articles written by him in the diocesan journal since the beginning of the war. The Archbishop speaks in a simple, fatherly tone to his people, sympathizing with their sorrows, strengthening their faith, and inculcating lessons of fortitude and of resignation to God's will. The volume expresses

the zeal of a bishop who has at heart the spiritual welfare of his flock.

In the February 8 *Catholic Mind* Father Peter Finlay, S.J., of the National University of Ireland, discusses the mutual relations of "Faith and Reason." Though the question is familiar to the Catholic apologist it is treated here with unusual clearness and cogency. The author explains briefly and satisfactorily the Galileo case, the Church's attitude toward Darwinism and toward other modern systems, and then answers conclusively the objections of those who maintain that the truths of Faith cannot be reconciled with the truths of Reason. The moving appeal for peace that the Holy Father made on Christmas Eve is also printed in this number, as are the wise reflections Margaret made on "A Set of Shaw," one of Mr. Lord's characteristic articles. Father Fisher ends the issue by briefly contrasting Catholic with non-Catholic marriages.

"A Short History of the English People" (Dutton, \$0.75) by John Richard Green is a two-volume work that has recently found a place in "Everyman's Library." L. Cecil Jane has revised and edited the text and contributed a preface, while about fifty pages containing "A Political and Social Survey of the Period from 1815-1914," have been written by R. P. Farley. Except for his glorification of the Puritans, Green's attractively written book gives the general reader a pretty fair account of England's history. The author's worthy aim was to keep his work from sinking into a mere "drum and trumpet history," to have little to say about "English Kings and English Conquests," but a great deal about "The English People." How well he achieved his purpose is proved by the wide popularity the book enjoys in this democratic age of ours.

"The Pioneers" (Doran, \$1.25), by Katharine Susannah Pritchard, a new Australian author, is dramatic in manner and matter, from the quiet days of the sowing for the future in the wilds of an uncultivated woodland, where Dan and Mary Cameron begin their rugged life, through the years of their son Davey's growth to sturdy manhood, and through Deidre Farrell's strange career, till the culminating clash of exciting incidents inevitably brings to the children the knowledge of a mother's shame and a father's disgrace, now wholly atoned for and lovingly forgiven. The author knows how to keep her pages interesting and her characters appealing.—"The Years of Plenty" (Doran, \$1.25) by Ivor Brown are the school years. The book portrays the psychological development of a normal boy, Martin Leigh, from his first day at boarding school to his last day at Oxford. During the intermediate stages he is in the crucible of school routine, neither man nor boy; he is developed and blindly developing himself into the well-fashioned cog of the world's machinery. The narrative is convincing and interesting, for the author has evidently faced the rows of desks from a teacher's platform.

"A Study in Socialism" (Herder, \$1.00), by Benedict Elder, is the first of a series of books dealing with modern social questions, the evils they imply and the correctives to be used. He has confined himself in the present work to a discussion of Scientific Socialism, considering it the only Socialism worthy of the name. This volume and the later ones he hopes will be found practicable as text-books. While the author has an unusual grasp of his subject and presents the arguments against Socialism in the most convincing way, applying wide historic knowledge as well as philosophic acumen to his study, it is a matter of regret that at the end of the book the Catholic student is referred to a long list of authorities from which Catholic writers, with one or two exceptions, are carefully excluded. Even Cathrein is not mentioned. On the other hand the works of

anarchists, atheists and Socialists of every hue are freely offered. For obvious reasons this is a mistake. Another point that needs slight retouching is the origin of authority. There is confusion here in the use of the terms "authority" and "power," and as a consequence, inaccuracy.

Mr. Joyce Kilmer contributes to the February *Catholic World* a paper on Lionel Johnson which ends with the following appraisal of the poet and his work:

He was not so great a poet as Francis Thompson. He never wrote a poem which will stand comparison with "The Hound of Heaven" or the "Orient Ode." But the sum of the beauty in all his work is great, and his poetry is, on the whole, more companionable than that of Francis Thompson; it is more human, more personal, more intimate. And to at least two of Lionel Johnson's poems, the adjective "great" may, by every sound critical standard, safely be applied. One of these is "The Dark Angel," a masterly study of the psychology of temptation, written in stanzas that glow with feeling, that are the direct and passionate utterance of the poet's soul, and yet are as polished and accurate as if their author's only purpose had been to make a thing of beauty. The other is "Te Martyrum Candidatus," a poem which may without question be given its place in any anthology which contains "Burning Babe," "The Kings," and Crashaw's "Hymn to Saint Teresa." It has seemed to me that these brave and beautiful lines, which have for their inspiration the love of God, and echo with their chiming syllables the hoof-beats of horses bearing knights to God's battles, might serve as a fitting epitaph for the accomplished scholar, the true poet, the noble and kindly Catholic gentleman who wrote them.

Ah, see the fair chivalry come, the companions of Christ!
White Horsemen, who ride on white horses, the Knights of God!
They, for their Lord and their Lover who sacrificed
All save the sweetness of treading where He first trod!

These through the darkness of death, the dominion of night,
Swept, and they woke in white places at morning tide:
They saw with their eyes, and sang for joy of the sight,
They saw with their eyes the Eyes of the Crucified.

Now, whithersoever He goeth, with Him they go:
White Horsemen, who ride on white horses, oh fair to see!
They ride, where the Rivers of Paradise flash and flow,
White Horsemen, with Christ their Captain: forever He!

Lionel Johnson was an Irish Catholic poet who is at last coming into his own. Let the literary world now give Aubrey De Vere the recognition he so richly deserves.

In "Notes sur le voyage de Chateaubriand en Amérique" (University of California Press) Gilbert Chinard takes up the interesting question of Chateaubriand's visit to this country in 1791, and attempts to reconcile some of the many contradictions in his various accounts of the same. The great man is at least partially absolved of the charge of plagiarism, and we are left with the hope of seeing his name finally cleared of the odious accusation.—"The Protection of Neutral Rights at Sea" (Sturgis & Walton, \$0.25) affords the close student of the war an excellent opportunity of calmly estimating the situation created by the naval warfare in its bearing upon this country. Sixty-seven documents are here offered, Prof. W. R. Shepherd contributing a clear and unbiased introduction.—"La Guerra Mundial," Roosevelt-Lara (Casa Editorial Maucci, Barcelona, \$0.75) is a Spanish translation of Theodore Roosevelt's papers on the European war. The author's idea of "preparedness" loses nothing in its Spanish dress, and Mr. Lara has also added Mr. Roosevelt's two articles on the Mexican situation. A footnote on page 266, asserting that the number of American marines killed at Vera Cruz was 400 or more, will be news to those who read in the papers that only twenty of our men were slain during the occupation of the city.

EDUCATION

In Defense of the Teacher

IS it a matter for wonderment that after twenty years of service in a grammar school, many a teacher regards the world with at least one jaundiced eye? Let us consider the query amicably. For two decades she has shepherded the lamblings of the flock, nor has she piped at noon-tide, as Amaryllis did with Corydon, under the shade of an aged aspen, tremulously whispering its never-ending story to the laughing, care-free brook. The age of fable is a book by Bulfinch, Theocritus has been dead these many ages, and this is the twentieth century in which we cannot afford to laugh as we work. She has a crook, this shepherdess of the public schools, but it is not tied with blue ribbons. If it was ever thus ornamented, the gay silken knots and strands of blue were long since bedraggled or quite worn away, in the constant task of prodding some heedless weanling into the narrow path, or of withdrawing him from the brake of bad grammar and the mire of cacography.

THE SCAPEGOAT

She is, in brief, no Watteau shepherdess, no flounced product of the famous art of Dresden. She is a matter-of-fact person who spends much valuable time in drawing up voluminous reports, and whose earlier notions of the sanctity of the individual's gifts and of the infallibility of Professor James, have been considerably modified by the tooth of time and experience. Her young belief in the angelic attributes of the child, she still retains, though qualified by the theological teaching that a third part of the heavenly host fell from their high estate. If her life is not made up of fears within and battles without, the description at least approximates the reality. For any stick, as she has learned by experience, is good enough to beat a teacher with, whether it be a curriculum, a principal, a fond parent with a grievance, or a threat of dismissal.

Wielding almost as much influence on general school policy as the janitor, in the eyes of the public she is the first and last cause of whatever apparent shortcomings or positive absurdities may be detected in our magnificent and unparalleled system of enforced education. The kings rage and the teachers are punished. The School Board welcomes to its fair city, some new pundit with a get-educated-quick scheme of teaching, a principal must convert his school into a social center, a psychological laboratory or a university of sloyd and raffia, and when it is discovered that in reading, writing, spelling, and arithmetic, eighth-grade Johnny ranks with the more advanced pupils of the mission schools in Van Diemen's Land or Monrovia, who is the scapegoat? Not all at once, please. Why the teacher, of course.

THE TEACHER ALWAYS WRONG

I am by way of having been a sort of a teacher myself, and therefore am never surprised at any charge which may be preferred against one of the craft. "The teacher is probably at fault" is a common attitude. Well may you start, and examine your conscience. Of you is the fable told. If the syntax of your pampered darling is of a type that would cause the late lamented Lindley Murray to shudder violently, forgetting your own lawless excursions into the land of verbs and pronouns, you rave as if the teacher were trying of set purpose to teach your boy a backwoods dialect. If, on the contrary, the child of your bosom "always learns his book," like Mark Twain's good little boy, "never plays hookey, and is so honest that he is simply ridiculous," you at once subscribe wholeheartedly to the doctrine of heredity. The teacher has nothing to do with your offspring's progress in science and virtue. Some of his good qualities, you allow, he gets from his mother; but if you are like most fathers,

you have no doubts as to the source of your boy's brains and his major claims to canonization. Meanwhile the harried teacher wonders happily why it is that your boy is so unlike his father, or is reflecting with a certain bitterness on the difficulty of teaching a child to write English when at home he is completely surrounded by slang, neologisms and *patois*.

HOW TO SUCCEED

Unless she is a novice, the teacher will be well aware that she is credited with the pupil's shortcomings only; that in an age which scoffs at miracles, she must be a second Thaumaturgus; and that although angels are excused when they have done their best, she is required by School Boards, principals, parents and the general public, to begin where the heavenly visitors leave off. Nay more; there is a general belief that she should be able to create a buoyant, brilliant intellect, inserting it into the soul of a child from whom the Infinite Creator for good reasons has withheld all but the essentials of a human understanding.

MISJUDGING THE PROFESSION

In few of these tasks does she succeed. But is she, therefore, to be blamed for the breakdown of American elementary education? Recently I listened with becoming reverence to a learned university professor who assured his audience that many public school teachers would further the progress of education by withdrawing to obscurity; and from his general tone I inferred that he would consider them nearer their true vocation were they employed exclusively in washing dishes or in canning corn. This is probably as true as the judgment that, were justice done, many university professors would be found not only chairless, a condition sufficiently distressing, but also unable to dig and too proud to beg. Certainly, women may be found in the public schools and in our own, who lack the teacher's essential gifts of intelligence, sympathy, and patience; others there are who are teachers not by choice but by chance of fortune or force of circumstances, and who would change their work if they could. But no profession is judged by its incompetents, its shirkers. For a stipend fully equal to that of the street-cleaners in our most advanced cities, our grammar-school teachers devote themselves, often nobly and unselfishly, to the trying work of teaching the young idea to do a great many things besides shoot. I often wish that their splendid energy so skilfully devoted to their many difficult tasks might include the training of the whole child, not merely of his intellect and body.

AUTOMATIC PROMOTIONS

But surely it is unfair to charge a teacher with incompetency, if the curriculum is as swollen as the liver of a Strasburg goose, or if she is confronted annually by a delegation of hopefuls, promoted not by virtue of any learning alleged to be in their possession, but because promotion is the rule. Either of these educational diseases cripples the efficiency of the teacher; when both are present, teaching can hardly be anything but a farce with the jokes left out. It is whispered, in fact stage-whispered, and emblazoned on the pages of the press, that in New York promotions are largely determined by the number of pupils for whom school accommodations must be found. "Teachers dare not be honest" is the blunt statement in the *Home News* for January 7. "The moguls who run the system demand a false percentage from the school, and insist on getting it. Teachers who honestly refuse to promote pupils soon learn that the men higher up disapprove of their action." The same charge is made by the *New York Herald* for January 12. "Children are hurried through the elementary schools," says this critic, "regardless of their fitness to advance from class to class. The whole idea is to keep the mass of children moving upward until they reach the

8B grade where most of them are dumped out into the world to begin the battle of life. The jam at the bottom is so tremendous that only by keeping the classes on the constant move can it be accommodated."

These criticisms are not quoted in the persuasion that they represent the exact truth. But it is fairly certain that they testify to tendencies existing in all large educational systems. What can the hapless teacher do in face of these difficulties, but bear the burden of the blame for pupils ignorant of the three R's? Experimentation in the schools, while costly, is an evidence of progress, and progress is bound up with "system." No individual can withstand a system, and few will care to try. It were profitless to try.

ADENOIDS AND ENVIRONMENT

"I once wrote in my report," remarked a public school teacher, now a principal, to the writer, "that a certain boy was not to be promoted. I said that he was not only somewhat stupid, but lazy and indifferent." This was a grave error. Summoned to headquarters the teacher was cross-examined, and it soon became plain that she was on trial for this required statement of her professional opinion. She now knows that a boy must never be accused of laziness. Laziness simply indicates the teacher's culpable inability "to arouse the pupil's dormant interest." Nor may she say that a pupil is stupid, first, because "anyone can teach a bright boy" as the bromide has it, and secondly, unless the teacher can rouse stupidity, or even twenty simultaneous cases of palpable stupidity, to transient gleams of cleverness, lasting long enough to light them through a set of examinations, she has mistaken her vocation, and should forthwith take up cooking or plain sewing.

In brief, the wise teacher will remark that while the pupil seems stupid, in reality he is suffering from adenoids, and that after some trifling medical attention he will bud into a very Solomon. If his adenoids have been recently removed, she will suggest that his undoubted but latent possibilities will be aroused by a change of environment. This done, with a sigh of relief she may gather up the debris and riff-raff of her class, and let it blossom into greatness under the warm sympathy of the new and smiling face which enlightens 6B across the corridor. True, before long 6B's introductory smile will change to a fixed glare, and the warm sympathy of the new environments to a cold antipathy, but what of that? As Thomas W. Lawson used to say with accusing capitals, We are All Victims of the Relentless System.

TEA-PARTY PHILOSOPHY

Perhaps this automatic promotion system has some cryptic connection with the fourteen-subject curriculum. I reason from an analogy which, however, I do not press. At the March Hare's Tea-party, a great many tea-things were set out, because there was no time "to wash the things between whiles" and therefore, as the Hatter remarked, the guests "had to keep moving round." So generously supplied with "things" is the modern curriculum that the pupil must skip joyously from place to place if all are to be even tasted. At least this is my explanation of that famous Seventh Chapter which is as full of puzzles and riddles as a modern curriculum, damp from the presses of New York, Gary, Oshkosh, or Fresno.

But exegesis is trying work. Whatever the connection between tea-parties, curricula, and the automatic promotion system may be, I merely suggest that we should not regard the teacher as low in intelligence because most of her pupils seem to be high-grade morons, and that we extend her that charity which Bret Harte did not refuse to the well-meaning, if incapable, mining-camp organist. She is not only well-meaning but, usually, efficient, and with very little sympathy and much unwarranted criticism, she is doing her best.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S. J.

SOCIOLOGY

Wholesale Contempt of Court

"MY advice," counseled the elder Mr. Weller, after the satisfactory dispatch of the famous valentine, "my advice 'ud be this here—never mind the character and stick to the alleybi. Nothing like an alleybi, Sammy; nothing." Mr. Weller has never been rated as an authority on legal procedure, for he "entertained a firm and unalterable resolution that the Old Bailey was the supreme court of judicature," and his dislike for men of the law was equaled only by his aversion for "vidders." But the good that men do lives after them. The bones of this venerable but untutored philosopher have long since been mingled with the dust of mother earth, but from the ashes of a lonely grave, his teaching springs, like the phoenix, to find a congenial home in the offices of twentieth-century legal advisers. Many a good but prosperous man has been saved for free air by a literal acceptance of the philosopher's counsel, which easily includes, as a kind of mental alibi, lapse of memory.

LAY CRITICISM

It is quite probable that lay criticism of courts and legal procedure, tempered as it usually is by a large admixture of nonsense and inaccuracy, must awaken merriment in professional breasts, when it does not move to wrath. Yet no profession can hold itself above criticism, or proceed on the theory that its special field of knowledge is synonymous with the sum of human wisdom. The legal profession, be it said to its credit, finds its severest critics in its own most able members. The reforms urgently recommended by the American Bar Association and set forth by such men as ex-President Taft, Mr. Root, Professors Pound, Wigmore and Taylor, would make substantial justice a reality, easy of access, and immediate. The law's sad delays are not wholly due to courts and to practitioners. Many have their origin in forces tolerated or welcomed by the people at large, and quite beyond the control of the judiciary; "freak" legislatures, for instance. In the storm of hasty criticism which the courts are now undergoing, it is well to remember that neither the honesty nor the ability of the Supreme Court has ever been successfully impugned, and that even so unsparing a critic as Lord Bryce admitted that "justice is fairly dispensed by the State courts throughout the Union."

Nevertheless the American courts, in general, have fallen from the high place which they once held in the popular mind. While this change may be due in some measure to the presence of Dodsons and Foggs in the profession, and of unworthy judges on the bench, yet he would be a rash critic who would find the adequate cause of this altered opinion in a complete, or even in a notable corruption of the bar or the judiciary. The real cause lies deeper.

BLASTING THE FOUNDATION

The courts are now bearing the brunt of a revolt against the principles which make civilized government a practical reality. Under the plea of free speech and a free press, we have been tolerant of attacks upon God and His representatives, upon the State and its officers, and upon the principles of right order which lie at the foundation of civilization. We have allowed the law of God to be thrown aside as a myth, and have applauded the corresponding revolt in literature and science, hailing it as the emancipation of the intellect. We have erected a vast and costly system of public education, in which the claims of God upon society and the individual are held to be of such small moment to civilization, that they may not even be considered. Under the plea of personal liberty, we have acquiesced in the principle of disintegration, that vice, cultured and perfumed, possibly, but vice for all that, has a tolerated if not a completely

legitimate place in the scope of human activities. By all these things have we unwittingly, it may be, yet powerfully contributed to break down the principle of authority in human government.

God, if He exists, must by His nature exact submission; the contingent character of man's being makes submission a natural necessity. But in destroying God, we have removed the very root and principle of authority. If we need not reverence God, how can reverence for man, or for anything that man has made, or with which he has surrounded himself, be reasonably exacted against the demands of self-seeking? We who have gradually undermined the foundation, the authority of God, can scarcely affect surprise at the revolt of the individual against the authority of a government which he considers the creature of his own making.

THE SOURCE OF AUTHORITY

Napoleon cynically thought that no State could endure without the sanction of religion, and accordingly proposed to make the Catholic Church a cog in the machinery of government. His conclusion was in essence blasphemous, but the principle was rooted in truth. All authority is from God, and only because it is from God, can it claim the allegiance of the individual. But a blatant faction that is increasing with ominous swiftness, urges that, without reference to God, all power resides in and emanates from the people; that authority is purely and simply the result of a free, loosely-welded compact between the individuals whose agent is the external, formal machinery called the State. The claim has been extended during the last decade by social anarchists, who appeal to an authority residing in them individually, to exempt them from the law and from judicial decisions, whenever the courts, or the law, are against what they hold to be "the public welfare."

In substance, this position does not differ from the plea of the anarchist who urges that any law of which he does not individually approve, is a violation of fundamental justice since it is a restriction of his personal liberty, or of the Marxian Socialist who sees a vague but sacred right destroyed by any exclusive title to property, or of any man who now pays the penalty of a violated law in the State penitentiary. Yet the principle is held not only by anarchists, Socialists, and convicted criminals, but by clergymen who have mistaken their vocation, and by university professors, luminaries in many American "seats of learning."

THE SANGER CASE

The Sanger case now pending in the Federal Court furnishes an excellent example in point. Some months ago, Mrs. Margaret Sanger was indicted by a Federal Grand Jury, on a charge of violating the postal laws by using the mails to disseminate directions for birth-restriction. The preliminary hearing was marked by a variety of disgraceful proceedings, in which the friends of the accused left little undone or unsaid to show their contempt both for the law and for the Court. "In a man-made world," writes an apologist, "Mrs. Sanger found a law which she fully understood. She felt that the law was repugnant to her sense of social obligations and duties. She therefore flung herself at the law." This defense, made in all seriousness, illustrates the completely self-centered spirit of the new social anarchy. Mrs. Sanger claims the liberty to violate a law which is repugnant to her social sense. Her apologist contends that she may freely flout public authority; public authority, however, must in no wise interfere with Mrs. Sanger, even though a law, expressive of the moral sense of the community, holds that Mrs. Sanger's acts are in violation of the rights of other citizens. Not the State therefore, but the individual, is to judge what is and what is not proper or licit, and if the State interferes, revolt becomes a duty and the highest loyalty.

DEFENDING A MARTYR

Further steps in the defense of Mrs. Sanger are thus outlined in a communication in the *New York Globe* for February 2.

A plan frequently mentioned, is for five hundred or more women to pass around copies of Mrs. Sanger's forbidden publication in the courtroom, and offer themselves as voluntary prisoners to the court. According to Professor Edwin A. Ross of the University of Wisconsin, such a proceeding would give the courts a bigger job than they could successfully handle, since a proper respect for public opinion is necessary to all successful use of the courts to maintain social peace.

Were some counter-demonstration to be proposed, Mrs. Sanger's followers would no doubt regard the movement, and properly, as anarchical. The individual most heedless of the rights of others is always loudest in his outcries when his rights, real or assumed, are molested. "In God's name," exclaims Stevenson, "why all this to-do?" Mrs. Sanger is a martyr to the cause of civilization; very well; but if this character be chosen, let her go to the stake as befits a martyr, and let her friends remember that if the executioner be killed, the witness is robbed of her crown of glory.

CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES

The Sanger indictment has achieved a notoriety hardly warranted by its character as an ordinary procedure under a Federal Statute. Its sole claim to public interest lies in the fact that it indicates the existence of a growing spirit of revolt which has been allowed to assume the mantle of altruism and philanthropy. Certainly, the Constitution of the United States guarantees "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances," but the modern social anarchist, on his own authority, has amended this Amendment by striking out the all-important "peaceably." The Constitution can hardly be interpreted as sanctioning mobs, or as guaranteeing a right of petition which is equivalent to a wholesale sustained contempt of court.

P. L. B.

NOTE AND COMMENT

How quickly "the whirligig of time" is moving, and what odd changes it brings with it in its dizzy round, is most strikingly illustrated in the little corner of the world where the Montenegrins have been struggling with the Austrians. Scutari, it had been said, was to have been held by the Montenegrins with the aid of Albanian troops under Essad Pasha, who had espoused the Montenegrin cause. Only three years previously he had desperately defended the same stronghold for months against the Montenegrin attacks. "When King Nicholas finally got possession of the city, April 27, 1912," further comments the *Independent*, "the British took it away from him and gave it to the Prussian Prince, William of Wied, who is now fighting the British to regain it." This is only one of the many similar anomalies which this conflict presents. National animosities are apparently as easily forgotten as political friendships. Moralists might gather from it lessons on the "mutability of human things."

The new Archbishop of Chicago, the Most Reverend George William Mundelein, is the second prelate whom New York has sent to govern the great Western See, and both these prelates are linked together by a curious incident. The first bishop was the Right Reverend William Quarter, who was pastor of old St. Mary's Church in Grand Street, New York, when, at the instance of Archbishop Hughes, he was chosen for the new See of Chicago. It was by Father Quarter's permission that, in April, 1835, under the leadership of the famous pioneer German pastor of New York, Brooklyn and Boston, Father John Stephen Raffeiner, the German Catholics of New York met in the base-

ment of St. Mary's Church and there organized the congregation that built St. Nicholas' Church in Second Street, Archbishop Mundelein's native parish. The progress of the Church in Chicago is thus related in this interesting way with two parishes on the East Side of New York. Old St. Mary's was one of the strongest Irish parishes in this city, and St. Nicholas', the first church here for German Catholics, was equally representative of the German colony. Both now form the heart of the great Jewish section of the East Side. When Bishop Quarter reached Chicago, in May, 1844, he found only two priests and one church (St. Mary's) in the straggling hamlet that had grown up about Fort Dearborn. Archbishop Mundelein will be welcomed by 790 priests, in charge of 326 churches, 219 of these edifices within the city limits, and a Catholic population of 1,250,000. The church property vested in his name is valued at \$42,000,000.

Out of the gloom of war that involved almost all Europe a century ago, last year, came the spark that was to enkindle the world. In 1822 the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was established and soon "spread through the war-stricken Continent of Europe and across the seas to this country, and to the peoples of South America." Such is the consoling statement made in the Twelfth Annual Report of the Society's Branch established for the Archdiocese of New York, which again leads the world in its contributions to the mission cause.

Today the Church is facing a like crisis. The countries that are the most generous in contributing to our missions are now locked in deadly conflict. They are looking for aid instead of giving it. But out of the gloom again comes the encouraging sign. The missions cannot fail, because God has raised up a generous people in this country, who will assume the holy privilege of sustaining bishops and priests and Sisters in their labors and sufferings and sacrifices for those others who have been called out of darkness into the light.

The contributions from the Archdiocese of New York during the past year have amounted to \$177,918.58. The increase in new members has been 1,500, and 804 perpetual members were enrolled. The contributions, however, from parishes where the Society is not yet organized are small. At the head of the list, as we might perhaps expect, is not the most prosperous of the parishes, but St. Ann's of Nyack, N. Y., which is neither a populous nor an opulent Catholic center. Zeal counts for far more in God's work than either means or numbers.

Mr. Balfour, First Lord of the British Admiralty, in his latest book, "Theism and Humanism," states clearly the reason that underlies the necessity of religious education, though such is not directly the application made by him. "A sense of humor," he says, "if nothing else, should prevent us wasting fine language on the splendor of the moral law and the reverential obedience owed to it by mankind," if we do not base morality itself upon religious principles. A world made up ultimately of mere material beings, directed to a certain extent by the law of selection, and beyond that left to chance, has no reason for concerning itself about moral laws. Reverence for morality would soon be set aside.

That debt will not long be paid if morality comes to be generally regarded as the casual effect of petty causes: comparable in its lowest manifestations with the appetites and terrors which rule, for their good, the animal creation; in its highest phases no more than a personal accomplishment, to be acquired or neglected at the bidding of individual caprice. More than this is needful if the noblest ideals are not to lose all power of appeal. Ethics must have its roots in the divine; and in the divine it must find its consummation.

It is for this reason that Catholics insist upon religious education and that their schools must rightly be considered as the mainstay of civilization. That morality may strike its roots

deep in supernatural religion, it is necessary that religion be daily kept before the mind of the pupil, as is constantly done in the Catholic classroom, from primary school to university.

"We rarely open the columns of the *Catholic Register*," says the Editor of the *Missionary*, "that we do not find there an account of recent accessions to the Church in the Rocky Mountain region." Catholicism, he believes, is taking itself seriously there. Catholics are realizing more clearly in that "atmosphere of sublimated rarity" that the express purpose of the Church is the saving of souls.

A new movement for making converts was launched in Denver recently by Rev. Walter Grace, of the parish of the Annunciation. A city-wide league of converts is to be formed, and each member will be asked to try and bring one friend into the Church within a year. Lectures are to be given by Father Grace and others for the benefit of inquirers. The purpose of the lectures is not alone to bring new members into the fold, but to put Catholicism in a better light before as many of the non-Catholic people as possible.

The work of the converts' league will likewise extend itself to bringing back fallen-away Catholics through the cooperation of the laity. It is needful that there should be everywhere an awakening of apostolic activity on the part of the Faithful. The Divine mission of the Church to spread the light of God's truth at home and abroad should be taken seriously by every one of her members.

How far we have progressed on "the back rail to heathenism" is plain from an official justification of "Academic Freedom" on the part of the national Bureau of Education, which issues a circular containing the implied convictions of Dr. S. P. Capen, the Bureau's specialist in higher education. He begins with the following exposition of the case:

That there is always some pressure exerted in academic communities, as elsewhere, to keep radical propagandists quiet and to discourage destructive criticism of the existing order none will deny. Its extent varies with the institution. As a rule, it is exerted subtly, often unconsciously, in large universities which are supposedly free. Generally it vanishes as soon as the right of free speech is publicly broached. Within the past two or three years, however, there have been so many recurrences of disciplinary action directed by trustees and presidents of prominent institutions against professors reputed to hold unorthodox political, economic, or religious views that the question of academic freedom has become temporarily one of the foremost issues in university administration.

In what follows he then questions the right of trustees and presidents, even of "private institutions," to dismiss professors who make themselves guilty of imbuing the minds of the young under their charge with radical doctrines and "unorthodox views." "Is any university," he asks, "even if partly or wholly supported by private endowment, a private university? Does the measure of its accountability to the public differ from that of the State university?" He would, therefore, if we understand him aright, question the authority of the President of a Catholic university to dismiss from his staff a professor teaching radicalism and modern paganism in the classroom over which he presides. And this destruction of the minds and souls of the young he cleverly defends in the name of "accountability to the public." Presidents and trustees of colleges are not indeed to exceed their power, but public order and morality must be safeguarded in public institutions and religious interests must be defended in the private establishments founded or endowed for this very purpose. Is the Bureau of Education casting a sop to Cerberus, or does it wish to undermine the rights of religious education whose purpose is the highest welfare of the State?